# AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. VII.—AUGUST, 1892.—NO. 2.

## "THE OMAR OF THE NEW WORLD."

SOME years ago I spent the greater part of the winter in the City of Mexico. While there I made frequent visits to *El Museo Nacional de Mexico*—the national museum—which always possessed for me a peculiar interest. There is much in the museum to arrest the attention of any one interested in science, history and archæology. It is especially rich in collections and records relating to the earlier inhabitants of the country, particularly the Toltecs and Aztecs. Indeed, as an unique witness of the civilization and achievements of a people who were once as eminent as they are now obscure, I know of nothing to compare with the treasures of Mexico's great museum unless it be the collections of the far-famed museum of Bulak, in Cairo. In both of these noble repositories are exhibited the relics of a civilization long past, of a people who, in their day, were the acknowledged leaders in art and science, and whose culture and genius, as attested by monuments of all kinds, have excited the admiration of all subsequent generations.

In Bulak, thanks to the founder of the museum, the erudite and indefatigable Mariette Pasha, and to the labors of Maspero, Brugsch, Schweinfurth and others, we have a glimpse of Nile-land as it was under the Pharaohs thousands of years ago. And in the hieroglyphics that cover the papyri, sarcophagi, blocks and slabs of stone therein collected are provided the materials for a history extending from the time of the builders of the pyramids to the reign of the last of the Ptolemies. It is strange, but it is true nevertheless, that it is only within the last half century that a history of Egypt has been possible. The discovery of the Rosetta stone, and the deciphering of its

mystic symbols by the immortal Champollion, opened, for the first time, the numberless treasure-houses—before practically valueless—of Egyptian lore and history. Now every inscription, every sphinx, obelisk, pyramid, temple and sarcophagus, as well as every roll of papyrus, has its story to tell, and in language that can no longer be mistaken or misunderstood.

In the Egypt of the New World—as Mexico is often styled—there is much to remind one of the Valley of the Nile. The points of resemblance between the inhabitants of the two countries are numerous and striking. Both Egyptians and Mexicans were as superior, in intellectual attainments, to their neighbors and contemporaries, as were the Greeks and Romans, in advance of the barbarians by whom they were surrounded, and with whom they were in almost constant conflict. If Egypt was the cradle of science in the Old World, Mexico was the birth-place of knowledge in the New. There is, too, a similarity in the monuments of the two countries that, after the lapse of so many ages, excites the astonishment of even the most casual observer. The pyramids of Gizeh and Sakkara have their analogues in those of Cholula and Teotihuacan. The stately temples of Thebes, Philae, Adydos and Medinet-Abou are matched by the cyclopean edifices of Mitla and the architectural wonders of Palenque and Chichen-Itza, of Uxmal and Mayapan. The statues of the Pharaohs, from the giant sculptures of Rameses the Great at Aboo-Simbel to those that have been brought to light by recent excavations in the buried cities of the Delta; the sphinxes of Memphis as well as the monster near Cheops; the obelisks of Carnak and Heliopolis naturally suggest comparison with equally marvelous objects found in such profusion in Chiapas, in Oaxaca, in and about Tula, throughout the vale of Anahuac and amid the rich and tangled forests of Yucatan. Among other conspicuous objects of Toltec and Aztec origin that have always attracted the attention of the learned are the celebrated calendar stone, formerly in the left wall of the Cathedral, but lately transferred to the Museum; the great sacrificial stone on which so many myriads of human victims were sacrificed in response to the behests of ignorance and superstition; the grotesque statues of Chac-Mool and Nehuazcoyotl, not to speak of others equally hideous and fantastic.

It would be outside the scope of this article to trace the many points of resemblance between the remarkable people of Ancient Egypt, and the equally remarkable race that held sway in Mexico previous to the arrival of Cortez. It were alike foreign to my pur-

pose to institute anything like a detailed comparison between the relics and monuments still scattered all over these countries, or those collected in the two grand museums of Bulak and Mexico. Any one who has ever visited the two lands, or studied the treasures of the two collections referred to, will be led almost irresistibly, to seek resemblances and make comparisons, so strikingly are the genius and the character of the Egyptian reproduced in the Toltec and the Aztec.

But while pursuing my invistigations in *El Museo Nacional*, meeting at every turn something that reminded me of the magnificent repository on the bank of the Nile, I was suddenly and painfully made aware that there was a difference in the *raison d'être* of the two collections. The chief, if not the sole object, of the museum of Bulak, is to aid one in determing the history of the past. Everything, therefore, is presented in such a manner as to enable the student to arrive at a correct knowledge of facts. Nowhere, in this noble institution, will one be confronted with anything that savors of prejudice or wilful ignorance. I regret that I cannot say as much for the museum, or rather those in charge of the museum of Mexico. For reasons that unbiased investigators would hesitate to accept, the curator, Sr. Sanchez, has forced the museum to appear as a witness for the perpetuation of a falsehood, and for the fostering of a prejudice that should long since have been relegated to that limbo, created for historical lies, by modern criticism and exact research. I refer to the alleged destruction of the antiquities and hieroglyphical records of the country by the early missionaries, and notably by the first Bishop and Archbishop of Mexico, Fray Don Juan Zurmarraga.

In looking over one of the official publications [1] of the museum, the first thing to arrest the attention of the reader is a historical notice of the institution written by the professor of zoology, Sr. D. Jesus Sanchez. At the very outset of his account we find the following sentence: "When the fury of the first Archbishop, Zumarraga, and that of the conquerors and missionaries had exhausted itself in destroying the writings and monuments of the Aztecs, all such records being considered as an invincible obstacle to the abolition of idolatry and the establishment of Christianity among the conquered peoples, there came a more enlightened period, when people began to realize the irreparable loss which had been sustained by the new world." And, a little further on, the same writer adds "the kings of

1 Anales del Museo. Tom. 1. Pag. 47.

Spain endeavored, as far as possible, to repair the evil occasioned by ignorance and fanaticism."

Such sweeping statements, in a work that should give only unquestioned facts, are something, it will be admitted, that is calculated to provoke surprise, if not resentment. One expects to meet such charges in works of which the bias is manifest, and in which prejudice and bigotry are frequently the chief characteristics, but in an official contribution to science, like the volume of the *Anales* just referred to, a gross misstatement of fact can admit of no palliation whatever, unless it be the plea of invincible ignorance. It is but fair, however, to Sr. Sanchez to observe that, if ignorance in a historian could ever be pleaded as an extenuating circumstance for making a statement unsupported by evidence, the Mexican professor is entitled to be treated with leniency in the case under consideration. He had, without sufficient examination, accepted as true a charge that many historians had made against the illustrious prelate of Mexico, and had taken it for granted that he was dealing with a fact of authentic history.

My studies of Mexican history had convinced me that the indictment made against Bishop Zumarraga and his confreres was, like many other facts of so-called history, something that reposed on nothing better than a fabrication, pure and simple. However, to get further information on the subject, I determined to call on the distinguished Mexican historian Sr. Don Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta, as I knew that he was fully informed regarding the question, and could, better than any one living, refer me to all the authorities bearing on the subject.

Sr. Icazbalceta has accomplished for the history of Mexico what the late, lamented John Gilmary Shea did for the history of our own country, and what the erudite and painstaking Janssens achieved for that of Germany. Indeed, the many respects in which these three eminent men closely resembled each other were quite extraordinary. They all had a genius for history, and a memory for facts and dates and names that was simply phenomenal. All three devoted special attention to the history of the sixteenth century, and all were successful in bringing to the light of day numerous important documents that had long been buried in oblivion. The *Bibliographia Mexicana del Siglo XVI*, a voluminous collection of precious documents, edited and published for the first time, a few years ago, is a monument to the zeal and erudition of the distinguished Mexican author, of which Catholics throughout the

world may justly feel proud. In this scholarly work, which is not so well known as it should be, one will find the best answer to the many erroneous statements made by superficial writers regarding the part taken by ecclesiastics in the work of civilizing and christianizing the nations of New Spain.

On my calling on Sr. Icazbalceta I found that he had just published a life of Bishop Zumarraga,[1] and that the work contained precisely the facts and information I was seeking. Indeed, so thoroughly has the illustrious author accomplished his task, that no one can pretend to an accurate knowledge of the subject under examination who has not read the chapter which discusses it *ex professo*, and, in such wise, as to terminate forever all further controversy.

The charge made by Sr. Sanchez in the *Anales del Museo* has been repeated by English and American writers with all the variations of which bigotry and prejudice could render it susceptible.

Robertson in his "History of America"[2] says: "The obscurity in which the ignorance of its conquerors involved the annals of Mexico was augmented by the superstition of those who succeeded them. As the memory of past events was preserved among the Mexicans by figures painted on skins, on cotton cloth, on a kind of pasteboard, or on the bark of trees, the early missionaries, unable to comprehend their meaning, and struck with their uncouth forms, conceived them to be monuments if idolatry, which ought to be destroyed, in order to facilitate the conversion of the Indians. In obedience to an edict issued by Juan de Zumarraga, a Franciscan monk, the first Bishop of Mexico, as many records of the ancient Mexican story as could be collected were committed to the flames. In consequence of this fanatical zeal of the monks who first visited New Spain,—which their successors soon began to lament—whatever knowledge of remote events such rude monuments contained was almost entirely lost; and no information remained, concerning the ancient revolution and policy of the empire, but what was derived from tradition, or from some fragments of their historical paintings that escaped the barbarous researches of Zumarraga."

Such a theme, as one might anticipate, was a grateful one to a writer like Prescott. It enabled him to give full reign to his fancy and afforded him a better opportunity of venting his spleen against

1 *Don Fray Juan de Zumarraga, Primer Obispo Y Arzobispo de Mexico, Estudio Biographico y Bibliographico, por Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta; Con un Appendice de Documentos Ineditos o Raros. Mexico; Antiqua Libreria de Andrade y Morales, Portal de Agustinos. No. 3, 1881.*

2 Book. vii, near the beginning.

the monks and the church than any other subject connected with the history of the conquest. We are not surprised, therefore, when we read his very highly colored account of the rôle which he attributes to the Bishop in the destruction of the manuscripts of the nation's archives.

"At the time of the arrival of the Spaniards," writes Prescott, "great quantities of these manuscripts were treasured up in the country. Numerous persons were employed in painting, and the dexterity of their operations excited the astonishment of the conquerors. Unfortunately this was mingled with other unworthy feelings. The strange, unknown characters inscribed on them excited suspicion. They were looked upon as magic scrolls; and were regarded in the light with the idols and temples, as the symbols of a pestilent superstition, that must be extirpated. The first Archbishop of Mexico, Don Juan de Zumarraga—a name that should be as immortal as that of Omar—collected these paintings from every quarter, especially from Tezcuco, the most cultivated capital in Auahuac, and the great depository of the national archives. He then caused them to be piled up in a "mountain-heap"—at it is called by the Spanish writers themselves—in the market-place of Tlatelolco and reduced them all to ashes. His great countryman Archbishop Ximens, had celebrated a similar *auto-da-fe*, of Arabic manuscripts in Granada, some twenty years before. Never did fanaticism achieve two more signal triumphs, than by the annihilation of so many curious monuments of human ingenuity and learning. The unlettered soldiers were not slow in imitating the example of their prelate. Every chart and volume which fell into their hands was wantonly destroyed so that when the scholars of a later and more enlightened age anxiously sought to recover some of these memorials of civilization, nearly all had perished and the few surviving were jealously hidden by the natives". [1]

Mr. Hubert Howe Bancroft reiterates the story in his voluminous but loosely put together work "The Native Races of the Pacific Coast." The chief, if not the only merit of Mr. Bancroft, as a historian, it may be remarked, *en passant*, lies in the fact that his footnotes, in which he cites his authorities, are apparently given with care and exactness, and that he has amassed a rare collection of manuscripts and other materials, which will always be of inestimable value to the student of history. In the subject under discussion he follows in the wake of Robertson and Prescott. And in lieu of stat-

1 History of the Conquest of Mexico, Book 1. ch. 4.

ing dispassionately the facts of the case, he takes occasion, as in numerous other places in his many ponderous tomes, to deliver a violent declamation against monks and bishops—but, as with Robertson and Prescott, the special object of his bitter invective is Mexico's first prelate, Don Fray Juan de Zumarraga. He says :—

"Unfortunately the picture-writings, particularly those in the hands of priests—those most highly prized by the native scholar, those which would, if preserved, have been of priceless value to the students of later times—while in common with the products of other arts they excited the admiration of the foreign invaders, at the same time they aroused the pious fears of the European priesthood. The nature of the writings was little understood. Their contents were deemed to be for the most part religious mysteries, painted devices of the devil, the strongest band that held the people to their aboriginal faith, and the most formidable abstacle in the way of their conversion to the true faith. The destruction of the pagan scrolls was deemed essential to the progress of the Church, and was consequently ordered, and most successfully carried out under the direction of the Bishops and their subordinates. The most famous of these fanatical destroyers of a New World's literature being Juan de Zumarraga, who made a public bonfire of the nation's archives. The fact already noticed, that the national annals were preserved together in a few of the larger cities, made the task of Zumarraga and his confreres comparatively an easy one, and all the more important records, with very few probable exceptions, were blotted from existence. The priests, however, sent some specimens, either originals or copies, home to Europe, where they attracted momentary curiosity and were then lost and forgotten. Many of the tribute rolls, and other paintings of the more ordinary class, with, perhaps, a few of the historical writings were hidden by the natives and thus saved from destruction." [1]

When one learns that Prescott was a friend and a correspondent of Icazbalceta—as is also Bancroft—and that both the one and the other, the latter especially, were in a position to get reliable information concerning the question with which we are now engaged, one must feel that there can be but very little excuse for their misrepresentations of the facts of history. They allowed themselves to be carried along with the current, because it afforded them a rare opportunity to indulge in a rhetorical harangue against persons and institutions with whom and with which they were not in sympathy, and because

1 Native Races of the Pacific Coast, Vol. ii, p. 527.

their natural bias, and preconceived notions, which are ill concealed, led them to cling to a fiction, rather that accept an authentic statement of fact which Sr. Icazbalceta was in a position to furnish on demand.

But, it will be urged, even the illustrious Humboldt rehearses the same charges as do the writers just quoted.[1] This is true, but it only goes to show how difficult it is sometimes, even for a great mind,—one earnestly seeking after truth,—to avoid being swayed by prejudgments and to steer clear of error; how almost impossible it may be to disentangle truth from the mazes of falsehood, when a determinate statement or proposition has been given a similitude of truth by dint of constant repetition from generation to generation. The saying of Voltaire, "Lie, lie, something will stick,"[2] is particularly applicable to the case in point, and shows how easy it is, not only to distort the facts of history, but to put in circulation errors and falsehoods that it may require centuries to eradicate.

We have given extracts from only a few writers all of whom are well known and recognized by the general public as standard authorities on the subjects which they respectively treat. Sr. Sanchez, in support of his thesis, quotes no fewer than eighteen authors, most of whom wrote in Spanish. Among the best known and most distinguished of these are Motolinia, Sahagun, Duran, Padilla, Herrera, Torquemada, Ixtlilxochitl, Clavijero and Alaman. Sr. Icazbalceta, however, goes much further. In addition to the authorities adduced by Sr. Sanchez he cites and critically examines the testimony of fifteen others, whom Sr. Sanchez had not consulted, or whom, at least, he does not mention in his *Reseña Historica*. Among these may be named Mendieta, Cavo, Veytia and the Italian traveler, Gemelli Careri. Sr. Icazbalceta thus summons before his tribunal no fewer than thirty-three witnesses, embracing all the more noteworthy writers on the question at issue, from Mr. Bancroft, the latest traducer of Bishop Zamarraga, to Pedro de Gante, who wrote in 1529. Examining each author in turn, beginning with Mr. Bancroft, he goes back to those who first gave currency to the charges which have so long obtained against the venerable prelate of Mexico. Some of the more modern witnesses he dismisses forthwith, because they fail to adduce the authorities on which they base their statements.

1 In his Vues des Cordillères, p. 26, Ed. in folio, he says, "Lorsque l' évêque Zumarraga, religieux Franciscain, entreprit de détruire tout ce qui avait rapport au culte, à l' histoire et aux antiquités des peuples indigènes de l' Amérique, il fit aussi briser les idoles de la plaine de Micoatl."

2 "Mentez, mentez il y en restera quelque chose."

Others he rejects because they are manifestly so prejudiced and so actuated by antipathy and passion that they are disqualified from testifying. Others still are excluded because in citing their authorities, they give the judge an opportunity of weighing the testimony as presented by the primitive authors. After a brief but searching examination, in which the judge surprises us at every step by his keen analytical treatment of the case no less than by his marvelously comprehensive knowledge of all the facts bearing on the question, he reduces the number of those competent to testify from thirty-three to thirteen. Twenty are at once pronounced incapable of giving evidence, either on account of strong prepossessions adverse to the accused, or because they simply repeated what had been stated by others before them.

These thirteen authors Sr. Icazbalceta divides into three classes according as they speak of the destruction of temples, or idols, or picture-writings. The reasons that prevailed for the destruction of temples or idols were not the same as those that would lead to the destruction of picture-writings, nor were the consequences flowing from such destruction the same in the three cases. Again, each one of these three divisions is subdivided into two others—the first embracing those authors who speak of the Bishop, and the second comprising those whose evidence relates to others, missionaries or not.

The destruction of the *teocallis*, or pagan temples, was a religious and a military necessity. The missionaries came to convert the Indians, and to bring them to a knowledge of the true faith. But they could have accomplished little or nothing if the natives had been left in undisturbed possession of their ancient places of worship. The pagan priests, who far outnumbered the missionaries, could under such circumstances have counteracted without effort all the results that could have been achieved by the ministers of the Gospel. The only thing, therefore, to be done, unless the work of christianizing the Indian was to be rendered futile, was to expel the pagan priests from their temples, and to prevent their return by razing the temples to the ground.

But even if the missionaries had not found themselves obliged to destroy the edifices dedicated to the worship of false gods and polluted by the blood of thousands of human victims, their destruction would still have been deemed an imperative necessity from a military point of view. Every *teocalli* was a fortress, and it was obviously an impossibility for a small handful of men to retain posses-

sion of the country for any length of time, if the Indians, who were but partially subdued, were allowed to retain what, in the event of revolt, would have been a most formidable means of offence and defence.

The peculiar form of the *teocallis*—being pyramids of earth or stone, surmounted by small wooden towers, and temples—was such as to preclude the possibility of converting them to uses other than those for which they had been designed. With the pagan temples of ancient Greece and Rome it was quite different. Their structure was of a character that admirably adapted them to the purposes of christian worship. The simple blessing of the church, was, therefore, all that was requisite to change them from habitations of Satan to the abodes of the true God.

Nevertheless the *teocallis* that were made of stone served one good purpose. They supplied material for the erection of churches and oratories. And the poor Aztecs, who had for generations been so inhumanly treated by their cruel priesthood, were only too glad to lend a helping hand toward demolishing the blood-stained edifices on whose altars had been sacrificed so many who were near and dear to them. The sacrificial stone, always reeking with human blood, was replaced by the altar of unbloody sacrifice, and the joyful bell, calling the people to prayer, was substituted for the mournful *teponaxtli*, whose lugubrious tones gave the signal for the slaughter of some new band of trembling and terror-stricken victims.

According to Motolinia, the work of demolishing the *teocallis* was begun January 1, 1525, in Tezcuco. But Bishop Zumarraga did not arrive in New Spain until December 1528—three years subsequently. He could, therefore, have had nothing to do with the destruction of the great *teocalli* in the Capital because this was decreed and effected by Cortez immediately after the taking of the city, and was one of the first things demanded before the task of rebuilding the city could be undertaken. The same may be said of the pyramidal temples in other places. The material of which they were constructed was required for the building of churches and chapels, and the majority of the *teocallis* were appropriated for this purpose before Bishop Zumarraga even set foot on Mexican soil. In summing up the evidence bearing on the destruction of the *teocallis* Sr. Icazbalceta declares: "I do not know of a single trustworthy document by means of which it can be proved that Bishop Zumarraga ever laid hands on a single temple". [1]

1 Op. cit. p. 346.

If there were reasons for the demolition of temples, there were still stronger ones for the annihilation of idols. In no other way could the Indians be effectually withdrawn from their heathenish customs and practices. And considering the incredible number of idols that were found everywhere, their total extirpation was no inconsiderable task. They were met with at every turn—in the house, in the garden, in parks and forests, on the mountain top, and in places where one would least expect to find them. Indeed so loath were some of the natives to part with their fetiches that, for surer safe-keeping, they concealed them at the foot of crosses and crucifixes.

Some writers, among them Clavigero, have affected to believe that the objects of worship of the Indians should have been preserved in museums for the benefit of students of a subsequent age. Such action would have been sheer folly—aye, worse than folly—madness. What interpretation would the Indians have put on such a procedure? Only one, and that, to them, the most natural one. They would have regarded the preservation of their idols, and the appointing of persons to take care of them, as a certain indication that the Spaniards themselves considered them as so many deities and would, accordingly, have construed any evidence of appreciation into an act of worship. The only course, therefore, left open to the missionaries, if they were to convince the Indians that their preaching was in accordance with their practice, was for them to be consistent. It was necessary for them to show their abhorrence of every form of idolatry, and to demonstrate to the benighted pagans that their idols could be treated with every kind of indignity, and broken into fragments, without the slightest fear that such actions would bring down upon the heads of those who dared such things the wrath and avenging thunderbolts of some outraged god. Hence idols wherever found, were overthrown. They were often, moreover, ignominiously cast into the fire, and thus treated as the meanest of criminals. They were defaced and broken and subjected to every species of contumely, until the Aztec had learned the lesson—which could not have been taught him so well in any other way—that his idols were as powerless to aid him as they were to help themselves, and that, far from being regarded as objects of worship, they were to be treated with contempt and reprobation.

And what share had Bishop Zumarraga in this justifiable destruction of idols? Very little indeed. Nothing that was done before his arrival at the close of the year 1528 can be attributed to him. It is true that he gave orders that the idol of Teotihuacan should

be precipitated from the high position which it occupied. A century later Gemelli found it broken in three pieces at the foot of the pyramid on which it had been located. Had there been any reason for preserving these pieces they could even then, easily have been reunited, and the idol would have been restored to its original form.

But aside from this solitary case, in which the Bishop simply performed his duty, there is not another instance that can be cited where he is known to have taken an active part in the destruction of idols. Ixtlilxochitl indeed accuses him of having destroyed the bass-relief of Tezcotzinco, but then, as we shall learn, the testimony of this writer is open to suspicion, and often deserving of little, or no credit whatever. Padilla also holds him responsible for defacing the figure of a coyote, sculptured in the solid rock, on the summit of a certain mountain. The last two charges, however, are so vague in their character, and the testimony, of at least one of the witnesses, so unreliable, that they can both be dismissed without further comment.

Pass we now to the alleged destruction of manuscripts, or picture-writings. Of the thirteen authors, out of the thirty-three, whose testimony Sr. Icazbalceta deemed worthy of examination, six must now be excluded, as they speak solely of the destruction of temples and idols, and make no allusion to that of pictures, or manuscripts. Only seven are now left, and of these seven we need consider but two—Torquemada, and Ixtlilxochitl. The former is the first to attribute to the Bishop the burning of manuscripts, but he says nothing of the archives of Tezcuco. It is of the latter writer that I shall have most to say, as he it was who originated the story regarding the extent and magnificence of the treasures preserved in the archives of Tezcuco. And as it is on the wholesale destruction of these archives that most stress has been laid, especially by modern authors, I shall, without further preamble, make a few brief observations regarding the character of Ixtlilxochitl as a historian, and inquire how far he merits our confidence in his statements anent the question now under investigation.

Don Fernando de Alvo Ixtlilxochitl, who wrote between the years 1600 and 1615 or 1616—over fifty years after the death of Bishop Zumarraga—[1] was a descendant of the kings of Tezcuco. Having been reduced to straitened circumstances, he deemed it politic, in order to interest the Spanish Government in his behalf, to exagger-

1. The venerable prelate died June 3, 1548, at the age of more than four score years. The exact date of his birth is unknown.

ate the glory of his ancestors and the splendor of their achievements in war and peace. According to him, Tezcuco was "the Athens of Anahuac; her king, the glorious descendant of the great Chichemecan monarchs, was the oracle of the kings of Mexico; the one whose voice was raised in council and who was always consulted in difficult cases. There the Mexican language was spoken in its greatest purity; there literature was cultivated and there likewise were preserved all the treasures of science and wisdom of the race. In Tezcuco were schools of poetry and music, of oratory and philosophy. Her temples and palaces and gardens surpassed in beauty and magnificence those of the great Tenochtitlan. He even goes so far as to assert that the kings of Mexico were tributary to those of Tezcuco."

If we now turn to another Aztec historian, Tezozomoc, we shall learn that the king of Tezcuco was nothing more than the first feudary of the Emperor of Mexico. We are told that the splendor of the Mexican court was unsurpassed and that the power of her rulers admitted neither division nor rivalry.

Which of the two authors shall we credit? For our present purpose the answer is immaterial. If we refuse to believe Ixtlilxochitl when declaring the existence of the archives, whose value he so highly extols, we need go no further, as that could not have been destroyed which did not exist. If, however, we credit his assertions about the existence of such archives, we must also accept his statements, when he declares, as he does in two different passages, that the Tlascalans, when they entered Tezcuco, in company with Cortez, set fire to "the principal palaces of king Nezahuilpilli in such wise that they burned *all* the royal archives of *all* New Spain, and the memory of her antiquities perished from that time."

The entrance of Cortez at the head of his army, into the city, was effected the last day of the year 1520. Eight years subsequently, Bishop Zumarraga came to Mexico for the first time. "What Tezcucan archives did he then burn, if they had already been *all* destroyed? Did he perchance set fire to the ashes of the papers previously burned by the Tlascalans?"

But we have not yet discovered the author of the story imputing to Bishop Zumarraga the burning of the archives of Tezcuco. Who was he? When did he live? What is his standing as an authority on the question? Neither Ixtlilxochitl nor Clavigero, nor any of the earlier writers ascribe to the Bishop this Omar-like act of vandalism. Who, then, is the author of the fiction?

Incredible as it may appear, the story was first fabricated towards the close of the last century by a certain writer by the name of Mier[1], nearly three centuries after the event is alleged to have occurred. Mier's friend and companion, Don Carlos Bustamente, took up the fabrication and, adding to it a few touches of his own, gave it a circulation that it has retained until the present time.

Both Mier and Bustamente had a special grudge against Spaniards and Bishops. In the estimation of the former Bishop Zumarraga was guilty of three unpardonable sins. He was a Spaniard. He was a monk. He was a Bishop.

Any one that has read aught of Mier is not surprised at his having invented such a fable as the one in question. He was fully capable of this and much more, as his writings evince on almost every page. But fortunately for the cause of truth and justice both Mier and Bustamente have at last received their deserts. Their unscrupulous tampering with the facts of history has been discovered, and they now stand with all impartial readers as utterly discredited. A Nemesis—just and certain— has overtaken them, and both the authors and their works have been summarily consigned to the dark and pitiless waters of Lethe.

But, it will be insisted, if Bishop Zumarraga did not burn the archives of Tezcuco, because they were not in existence at his time, he was guilty, nevertheless, of what was equivalent to this in destroying all the picture-writings on which he could lay his hands.

We come again to a question of fact. Did the Bishop do what his accusers maintain that he did, or is he to be pronounced innocent of the charge so often preferred against him?

The only evidence that can be produced to substantiate this last charge is that which is based on a letter, written by the Bishop himself, to the general chapter of Tolosa, held in June, 1531. In this letter, that has given rise to much disputation, occurs the following sentence: "Baptizata sunt plusquam ducenta quinquaginta millia hominum; quinginta deorum templa sunt destructa, et plusquam vicies mille *figurae daemonum*, quas adorabant fractae, et combustae.[2]

The whole controversy here, as will be seen at a glance, turns on

1. His words, as quoted by Icazbalceta, p. 317, op. cit., are "Al primer obispo de Mexico se le antojo que todos los manuscritos simbolicos de los indios eran figuras magicas, hechicerias y demonios, y se hizo un deber religioso de exterinarlos por si y por medio de de los misioneros, entregando a las llamas todas las liberias de los Aztecas de los quales solo la de Tezcuco, que era su Atenas, se levaba *tan alta como una montana*, cuando de ordeu de Zumarraga la sacaron a quemar."

2. Various copies of this letter, in Latin and in Spanish, are given in the valuable appendix of Sr. Icazbalceta's learned monograph.

the meaning of the words "*figurae daemonum.*" The earlier writers understood them to signify false gods or idols, and Sr. Icazbalceta contends that this is the only meaning that history and sound criticism will permit one to assign them. Those, however, who take the opposite view argue that "*figurae daemonum*" must refer to picture-writings because of the word *combustae*—burnt—which, they maintain, could not apply to such incombustible materials as idols of stone. These objectors forget that there were idols of paper and wood as well as of stone. They lose sight too of the fact that even those of stone were not infrequently covered with cloth and other inflammable material, and that it was a common occurrence to cast stone idols into the fire, to show thus the execration in which they should be held, and then break them in pieces afterwards.

Such being the case, what becomes of the indictment so often brought against the venerable prelate concerning the part he is reputed to have taken in the destruction of the records of the country of his adoption? The words of the letter just quoted cannot, as we have seen, bear the interpretation so often put upon them by the bishop's vilifiers. The testimony of Ixtlilxochitl, so frequently adduced, is of no value. That of his contemporary, Torquemada, rests on only vague surmises and on the artful fabrications of certain Indians—*Indios embusteros*, Icazbalceta styles them—whom the Spanish historian employed as interpreters, and who, to conceal their ignorance, and to further their own designs, intentionally led him into many and grave errors. Mier and Bustamente—the fathers of the story about the burning of the "mountain-heap" of precious documents that Prescott so much laments,—are, for reasons already given, entirely ruled out of court.

Sr. Icazbalceta's answer to the question just asked, is short and to the point. "There is," he says, "no *certainty* that there is due to Bishop Zumarraga the destruction of a single picture." [1]

We might securely rest our case on this positive and emphatic declaration of the distinguished historian. But the desire completely to vindicate the character of the much maligned Bishop impels me to make a few observations more, concerning himself and his associates.

It betrays an utter ignorance of the life and achievements of the man, to refer to him, as so many have done, as an ignorant vandal, a fanatical iconoclast, the Omar of the New World, as one actuated, by "brutal, superstitious and voluntary ignorance"—these are

1 Op. cit—p. 364.

Bustamente's words—for nothing could be farther from the truth. Even Sr. Sanchez is forced to acknowledge that the Bishop was a man of great energy and humility, a personage of exalted virtue and apostolic zeal, and the valiant defender of the Indian, to whom he was ever a friend and a father.

Bishop Zumarraga, as his biographer demonstrates, was without peradventure, a man who would have reflected honor on any country and on any age. As an ecclesiastic, he will compare favorably with the most eminent of his countrymen. As a statesman he won the confidence of the rulers of Spain, and commanded the respect and admiration of the authorities in the land of the Aztec.

He was, in every sense of the word, the shepherd of his flock. He was their defender against their oppressors, and their benefactor in sickness and distress. At his own expense, he erected hospitals and asylums, and made provision for the widow and the orphan. He built schools and colleges for the education of the natives, and endeavored, by every means in his power, to secure for them all the benefits of a christian civilization.

That he might be able to carry on more effectually and more expeditiously the work of instructing the Indian, he sent to Spain for a printing-press, and had etablished in his episcopal city, under his immediate supervision, the first printing-office in the New World. On this press were printed books in both the Spanish and Mexican languages, and the number of works published during the lifetime of the far-seeing prelate would be a matter of astonishment to those who have been taught to regard him as a narrow-minded, ignorant monk.

Besides having others write for the instruction of his people he wrote much himself. Indeed, some of the most useful and most popular works then published were from his facile and prolific pen. They were mostly plain expositions of christian doctrine and were admirably adapted to the capacity of those for whom they were intended. They were characterized by a simplicity, directness, and persuasiveness that gave them a power for good that few similar works have ever possessed in such an eminent degree. He may not be ranked among the classic authors of Spain, he had not the elegance of diction of Fray Luis de Granada, but he had the faculty of expressing the saving truths of the Gospel with a force and an unction that appealed to the heart as well as to the intellect, with an effect that was almost irresistible. Even to-day, some of his works might be read with nearly as much profit and edification as when they were first published.

And with all his other cares he found time to organize and develop many new industries that were destined soon to contribute materially to the public weal. He caused to be brought from Spain the most valuable kinds of fruit trees, and had them planted where he thought they would thrive best. He fostered sericulture, and the manufacture of silk, and so great was the amount produced that it soon became an important article of commerce. The same may be said of the cultivation of flax and the production of linen. He also caused to be imported such domestic animals as were judged to be most useful to his people. To teach the Indians various trades, and to familiarize them with European methods of agriculture and manufacture, he invited laborers and artisans from Spain, and brought them to Mexico at his own expense.

As a Churchman he recalls to our minds St. Thomas of Villanova, and St. Isidore of Seville. As an administrator, there was much in him that gave such eclat to the career of his illustrious countryman Cardinal Ximenes. As a statesman and a diplomat, obliged to deal, at one time with the Emperor, at another with the viceroy, and again with councils and chapters without number, he exhibited all the sagacity and enterprise and comprehensiveness of view that so distinguished Richelieu, without, however, displaying any of those qualities which have made the great Cardinal the object of so much adverse criticism.

And, yet, it is this man, who did so much to ameliorate the condition of the Indian and to elevate him to a higher plane ; who was an energetic promoter, if not the organizer, of every movement that tended to develop the resources of the country ; who contributed so much to the dissemination of knowledge among the masses, and labored so assiduously and successfully in the cause of higher education ; whose whole life was marked by a spirit of enterprise, liberality and broadmindedness that always distinguish genuine greatness—it is this man, the honor of his age and country, and the benefactor of his race, that certain prejudiced and superficial writers would have us believe was an ignorant, fanatical monk, whose sole mission was to keep the world in ignorance, and whose highest ambition was the aggrandizement, even at the sacrifice of honor and principle, of the community to which he belonged, and the Church of which he was a representative. Well might one exclaim with the Roman orator, "*O tempora, O mores.*" But, thank God, the light of truth is at last beginning to break in upon the obscurity that has so long prevailed, and that has so long prevented one of the noblest of men from being seen and known in his true character.

What has been said of Bishop Zumarraga regarding the part he took in the destruction of the nation's archives, and of precious manuscripts can also, in great measure, be iterated of his associates, the monks and priests who were his coadjutors in the work of evangelizing the Indian.

They are accused of having destroyed historical records that would now be of priceless value. But no one, even when challenged to do so, has ever yet stated what was destroyed, when, or by whom. It is sufficient here to affirm that the charges made against the early missionaries have been grossly exaggerated. In many respects the charges are demonstrably false. For reasons, which at the time were deemed justifiable, they did, indeed, it may be admitted, destroy some picture-writings, but when they discovered their mistake, they made ample reparation for all the losses they had occasioned.

It is obviously not my purpose to make an apology for the missionaries for having destroyed idols and pagan temples. They would have been derelict in one of their first duties if they had done otherwise. Neither is it my intention to minimize the importance of some of the records that have disappeared, nor to undervalue anything that would throw light on the history of Mexico before the Conquest. But I must enter an emphatic protest against holding innocent men responsible for what they never did, or even thought of doing—what they could not have done even if they had been so minded.

It is a notorious fact that the picture-writings of Mexico had suffered serious losses even before the missionaries had touched the shores of the country. Sahagun relates the destruction of such records by the Indians in the time of King Izcoatl. Pomar, as well as Ixtlilxochitl, recount the burning by the Tlascalans of the archives of Tezcuco. In order to gain possession of the city of Mexico, Cortez found himself compelled to demolish the greater part of it, including the *teocallis*. With this wholesale devastation of the Capital disappeared many, if not most, of the annals therein preserved. Add to these three great causes of destruction—with which the missionaries, and much more Bishop Zumarraga, had nothing to do—the various losses incident to the long and protracted wars that desolated the country, as well as those that were entailed by neglect and the ravages of time, and we shall find that, at the period of the arrival of the missionaries, there was not much left for them to destroy, even if they had been so inclined.

Certainly there were no longer in existence those "mountains of manuscripts" that fanciful writers tell us of, which according to Don Ignacio Cubas, were sufficient to feed the flames of a large bonfire for *three months*. Neither have we any reason for believing that these documents possessed that intrinsic value attributed to them by Sr. Cubas—still less that there were consigned to them invaluable secrets and discoveries that were unknown to civilized Europe. Historians of the Draper stamp are wont to claim the beginnings in every art and science for the mystical and much overrated Arabs of the Middle Ages. Sr. Cubas, as his writtings evince, does not hesitate to make a like claim for the unknown and overlauded annalists of Mexico.

On reading his description of the great bonfire one would imagine that Sr. Cubas was an eye-witness—so detailed is his account—instead of a chronicler, who lived full three centuries after the date to which the event is assigned. And so precise is the information he vouchsafes us regarding the contents of the manuscripts consumed by the flames, that we should infer that he had at hand a catalogue of all the libraries then and there destroyed. But the careful student of history will find that the statements of Cubas, unsupported as they are, by any reference, are no more deserving of credence than the assertion of Robertson regarding the *special edict* of Bishop Zumárraga ordering the destruction of the nation's archives—an edict which Icazbalceta does not hesitate to state no one has ever seen, for the simple reason that it was never issued.

It has been averred that the missionaries made ample reparation for any losses of which through inadvertence or lack of information, they may have been the cause. Indeed, all the knowledge that we now possess regarding the history of ancient Mexico we owe to them. They were the first to learn the languages of the peoples with whom they came in contact; the first to collect and preserve what was left of the past history of the nation; and the first to interpret and translate the picture-writings, and thus make them available for students and historians of a later age.

But yet more. It must not be forgotten that the only value that Mexican picture-writings now possess is that given them by the works of the much abused monks and ecclesiastics who lived and labored in Mexico immediately after the Conquest. Without their writings, the hieroglyphical records of Mexico would be as unintelligible, as were those of Egypt before the grand discovery of Champollion. It is easy for plagiarists and sciolists of a subsequent

period to cast reproach on the missionaries who labored during the first century after the settlement of Mexico by the Spaniards, but it must be borne in mind, that it was these same missionaries, and they alone, who have given us the key to the interpretation of the native records, and that they it is who have supplied us with all the materials of the nation's history which are now at our disposal. Without their contributions the history of Mexico before the advent of the Spaniards would be impossible, and we should to-day, know little more of the country and its early inhabitants than is now known of the Mound-Builders of Ohio and Illinois, of the Cliff-Dwellers of Arizona and Colorado.

To recapitulate. Thanks to the masterly *Estudio Biographico y Bibliographico* of Sr. Icazbalceta, whose argument I have endeavored to present as clearly as possible in the foregoing pages, we are now able to view the life and character of the venerable pioneer Bishop of Mexico in their true light. Far from being an ignorant and fanatical iconoclast, the destroyer of a nation's records, and the treasures of a new world's literature, he was one of the most intelligent, progressive and generous spirits of his own, or of any age. This is proved to demonstration by every act of his episcopal career.

That Bishop Zumarraga destroyed a single temple there is no evidence whatever. Had he done so, no reasonable man could find fault with him, as the reasons for their destruction were, as we have seen, numerous and imperative.

Authentic history tells us of only one idol—that of Teotihuacan—destroyed in direct pursuance of his orders. No doubt many others were destroyed with his knowledge and approval. It would be a strange thing indeed to see a christian bishop, in a pagan country, so far forgetting his primal duty as to not remove the worst stumbling blocks standing in the way of a people's entrance into the Fold of Christ. But we are speaking not of a question of duty—but of a question of fact. Had not the work of demolishing temples and destroying idols been well under way, if not almost completed, before the Bishop's arrival, there can be no doubt that he would have done his duty as intrepidly and as thoroughly as it had been performed by those who were in the field before him.

As to the great rock of scandal—as Sr. Icazbalceta calls it—the destruction of the national archives, there is no certainty that the Bishop ever destroyed, directly or indirectly, a single manuscript. No one ever charged him with having done so until over half a cen-

tury after his death. It was then, when all who had known the venerable prelate were dead, and when, consequently, no one could rise up to contradict their statements, that Torquemada and Ixtlilxochitl published those libels, and originated those calumnies which have constituted the foundation of all those bitter invectives and envenomed diatribes that have so long been directed against one of the best and noblest of men. Excluding the testimony of the two authors just mentioned, because, as we have learned, it is impeachable on so many grounds—every presumption is in the Bishop's favor. His earnest and persevering efforts in behalf of education, the establishment, shortly after his arrival, of a school in his episcopal city for the interpretation of picture-writings, the personal interest he manifested in everything that related to the history and traditions of the aborigines—as is evinced among other things by his *Memoria* to the Council of Trent, concerning the antiquities of New Spain—all go to demonstrate that Bishop Zumarraga was, in sentiment and in action, the very opposite of what he is represented to have been by a certain class of writers whose *dicta* have been accepted, almost universally, as the incontrovertible facts of history.

"Sound criticism," says Sr. Icazbalceta, in concluding his elaborate investigation—and I am glad to terminate this long article in his own words—"can no longer permit the repetition of these absurd charges against the missionaries, and in particular, those against Bishop Zumarraga. The one who still persists in maintaining such an absurdity simply declares how superficial have been his studies, and how completely he is under the dominion of passion."

J. A. ZAHM, C. S. C.

---

## TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

(FIRST ARTICLE.)

IF there is any one question more likely than another to affect deeply and widely the people of this country, it is, we venture to say, what is commonly known as the "Temperance Question." It is not necessary to go largely into the matter to prove this. The enthusiasm which ever attends on the temperance meeting —the crowded halls, the eloquence of the speakers, the sympathy all feel with sincere workers for it; the existence too of the Prohibition Party; the laws introduced to prohibit the traffic

in spirits, or to moderate it, through high license—all go to show how deeply seated is the feeling in its favor. It is not a thing of yesterday ; it has been agitated among English-speaking people for well nigh a century. The fame of F. Mathew endures. His friends style him the Apostle of Temperance, and in truth, whatever may be said of his system or method, he deserves the gratitude of immense multitudes rescued by him from excess in drinking and its direful consequences.

There are those who advocate Total Abstinence as a reaction in their own case ; there are others who do so through a noble motive of aiding their brethren ; both are to be commended, but no one will deny that a far greater meed of praise is due to him who, having no need to do so, by word and example enforces the observance of it. There is something in this both noble and heroic. But precisely because there is in it the noble and the heroic, it is likely that those who will do so will not be very numerous, in proportion to the community. For a perpetuated movement of this kind there must be some powerful evil to avert, a great good to be obtained, and hence Total Abstinence is more likely to be sustained and advocated as a remedial measure, preventive of a vast amount of evil moral and social. As it therefore more properly has the nature or character of a protest against the abuse of spirituous drinks, it is to be expected that those who have suffered from such abuse will most loudly and feelingly advocate it. But when excitement and feeling come into play, there is likely to be excess, showing itself in arguments pushed too far, or lacking in soundness, and in measures which reason cannot always approve. Thus for example the moderate use of alcoholic beverages is cried down, and even condemned as sinful ; those dealing in them are spoken of as guilty of sin, and measures are introduced which take away individual rights, to prevent a comparatively small number, (for drunkards are the exception in any community,) from doing harm by excess in drinking,—and that with little success, for those addicted to excess always manage to find "a hole in the wall." It seems to us, the best way to help the cause is to preserve it from its erring friends ; for what is based on truth is sure to commend itself to the thoughtful, and the prevention of mistakes guarantees success. It is for this reason, that having been requested to write these articles, we propose to give the correct view on this subject of Total Abstinence, and on what relates to it ; and this all the more, because there are not lacking the best of reasons for keeping it up.

We have said that Total Abstinence is a remedial measure; its purpose is to remedy an abuse. An abuse means or implies a use which is not in itself bad, in other words good, in which there is no moral evil. A long time ago St. Augustine laid down the principle: "evil is the result of enjoyment of those things which should only be used; *velle utendis frui.*" St. Thomas of Aquin too, lays down the rule: *agere cum delectatione non est peccatum; agere propter delectationem peccatum est.* "To do what it is lawful to do, *with pleasure*, is no sin; but to do the same thing *for the pleasure of it only* is a sin." These rules may be said more properly to apply to the gratification of sense, as for example eating and drinking. The evil, therefore, which Total Abstinence wars against, intemperance, consists in abuse; it is the enjoyment of drinking for the sake of the pleasure, and the excess of that enjoyment. The use of the same beverage because needed, useful, wholesome, medicinal, is not sinful. Hence the reasonable and moderate use of wine or alcoholic drinks is prohibited by no law, and if enjoyed, while used for a proper purpose, as refreshment, is in no wise sinful. It might be said that the supposition of the use of alcoholic drink being ever wholesome, useful, or necessary is untenable. But this is not so. The testimony, experience, and practice of the human race is against any such absolute assertion. What is to be said then of the charts scientific men have prepared, which are in use in schools, demonstrating the effects of alcohol on the liver and on the stomach?

The answer is simple. These effects are the result of excess; a moderate rational use of wine and spirits produces no such effects.

But we have known such effects in the case of persons who never were intoxicated; what then? That may be; but a person has not to become intoxicated before drinking to excess. He is guilty of excess when he drinks more than he needs, or more frequently than necessary. The secret tippler may be in a continual state of sin, though externally he may give no indication of his habit; and in all probability will have a hob-nailed liver, or a chronic inflamed condition of the coats of his stomach, before the man who drinks openly, and now and then only gets drunk.

St. Thomas of Aquin treats this matter of drinking very clearly, as is his wont. Question 149, $2^{a}$. $2^{ae}$. he says sobriety is a special virtue which keeps away the special impediment to reason which comes from the fumes of strong drink, and he goes on to ask whether the use of wine is in itself wholly unlawful; and he answers no: just as no food or drink except accidentally; as for example, if

wine do not agree with one, or he exceed his measure, or act against a vow, or give scandal. As will be seen, this enumeration of exceptional cases which render the use of wine unlawful, only goes to strengthen his proposition, that the use of wine, in itself, is not unlawful: *Bibere vinum, secundum se loquendo, non est illicitum.* With these principles clearly understood, there is no impediment to the establishment of societies which more or less control or exclude the use of wine or liquors, such as for instance, the Society of the Sacred Thirst, which had its origin in Armagh, and requires its members to say certain prayers in honor of the thirst of our Lord on the cross, and especially to abstain from the use of wine and spirituous drinks on Friday; other societies which permit wine and beer, but rigidly exclude alcoholic drinks; and finally the Total Abstinence Society which has the approbation of the Holy See, and has done so great and widespread good. These societies are all governed by sound Catholic principle, and do not admit of the fanaticism which condemns as criminal any who do not follow their practices. It is this which recommends to the approval of the country the action of Catholics in this important matter, and which caused one of the most prominent statesmen of our day to remark to the writer: "I like the position of the Catholic Church with regard to temperance; it is temperance without fanaticism."

What has been a source of detriment to the movement favoring Total Abstinence, has been this fanaticism in the past, now in great part done away with. The excitement with which it was deemed necessary to introduce and keep up the movement, as it was important to arrest attention and make men think, had the effect as always happens, of putting under a ban those who would not take the pledge. This pledge was given by F. Mathew, with such an accompaniment of religious rite, as to impress with its solemnity, and lead those taking it to regard those who did not as wanting in their duty, and to consider the breaking of the pledge as the violation of a vow. This thing was kept up for many years after the death of F. Mathew, and perhaps even now obtains. The writer has frequently met with those who had this false idea, and who really from a false conscience did commit a mortal sin by "breaking the pledge." Such a sin could be committed only on the supposition that the pledge was a vow, a solemn promise made to God to do a good thing. As we understand it, those who introduced and perpetuated the practice of taking the pledge never intended it should be looked on as a vow; they would have done wrong had

they so intended it, and made those taking it so understand. In itself the privation is a serious one and so onerous that it has not unfrequently been broken, besides being a source of infinite scruple. Now no one has a right to increase the chances of sin ; that is folly. It is wisdom to diminish such chances. At most the pledge could be considered merely a solemn resolution to abstain, as a matter of good to oneself and to one's neighbor. The use of wine and spirituous liquors not being in itself wrong, no human enactment, such as the pledge, could make it so ; for a sin is something in thought, or in word, or in deed, against the law of God. The law of man derives its authority from the law of God, upon which we must fall back when we wish to show a thing sinful. To break the pledge, therefore, is to break one's resolution, to act dishonorably, as one is believed to keep it, and on that account enjoys honor and certain privileges. On the other hand this pledge, rightly understood, is very useful, and helps greatly a life of sobriety. It seems to us that besides the impression made upon the pledge-taker, it protects him from temptation, and especially from conviviality, from the frequenting of places and company dangerous to himself, from invitations to drink ; while on the other hand, it brings him in contact with those disposed as he is, whose sober, and regular, and industrious life is a safe-guard to him, and an encouragement. This of itself is enough to authorize the perpetuation of the right use of the pledge, in spreading the practice of Total Abstinence.

An objection might be made to what has just been said regarding the breaking of the pledge. Is not the assertion that the breaking of the pledge is not sinful too sweeping ? Is it not sometimes sinful? We answer : it is ; but that is as the phrase goes, *per accidens*, and not from the nature of the pledge. It may happen that a a man who takes the pledge is so weak that he cannot resist temptation ; his appetite for drink is so strong, that if he takes one glass, he will take another and another, and so drink to excess. In this case most certainly the man sins, not precisely by breaking the pledge, but in doing so he puts himself in the proximate occasion of becoming intoxicated ; and for this reason his first glass is or is likely to be, a mortal sin ; we say likely to be, because some especial reason might make it only venially sinful, or in some rare case not sinful at all.

A further objection might be urged on the ground of a contract with a temperance society entered into by the one taking the pledge. The society agrees to give him aid and the enjoyment of certain

privileges it can bestow and that on condition of the pledge as a *sine qua non*. Is not the breaking of the pledge a violation of the contract, and does it not constitute a sin against justice? It seems to us that several things must be considered. Does this man pay his dues? Does he also perform other duties imposed upon him by the society? If he does, he makes the return upon which the obligation to render him aid rests, and he does not sin against justice in breaking the pledge. If this man is entitled to aid and enjoys privileges simply on account of having taking the pledge, and for no other reason, should he break the pledge and continue to enjoy his privileges and have pecuniary aid in sickness, he sins against commutative justice; not however if, after having broken the pledge, he honorably withdraws from the society. The best thing he can do however is to go to his chief director, acknowledge his fault, and renew his pledge: for there is none so ready to be indulgent to human weakness and to condone a moment of forgetfulness as the guides whose experience in directing souls is apt to make them considerate; and that all the more, the greater such experience is.

F. S. CHATARD.

---

## A CHAPTER IN MOSAIC THEODICY.

IN Hebr. iii, 1—19, xii, 24—29 and Act. vii, 37, Christ is described as the Moses of the New Testament, as the Apostle, or Messenger, of God to his people. No other person in the Old Testament could have furnished this parallel. And since in both type and antitype, the prophet was incessantly united with the Mediator between man and God, a study of the Mosaic view of God will be instructive as well as interesting. In order to understand the Mosaic Theodicy the more clearly, we shall first consider the divine names Moses employs, secondly the definition he gives of God, and in the third place his doctrine regarding the divine attributes and persons.

Our English and Latin versions of the Pentateuch are misleading, when there is question of the exact distinction between the divine names employed in the Hebrew text. Though the word "Lord" (Dominus) generally renders the Hebrew "Jahveh" (Jehovah), still it stands at times for the more generic "Elohim" (God).

We do not say that the original use of the divine names is entirely neglected in our versions; but their systematic occurrence in the original text has not been fully rendered in the versions. We must then be allowed to investigate the Mosaic use of the divine names according to the Hebrew text.

In Genesis i, 1—ii, 3, "Elohim" is invariably used to indicate the divinity, while in the succeeding section, Gen. ii, 4—iii, 24, the double name "Elohim—Jahveh" is constantly employed for the same purpose. The same sectional change of the divine name may be traced throughout the entire book of Genesis and the first five chapters of Exodus. In some portions God is called "Elohim," in others "Jahveh," and in others again both names are combined. A third divine name, or rather class of names, is noticeable in the Pentateuch. Here belong "El-Shadday" (the Almighty), "El—'Elyon" (the most High), "El-cOlam" (the Eternal), "Adonay" (the Lord) and all similar expressions. These names, however, occur more rarely, and mostly in conjunction with either Elohim or Jahveh.

Wellhausen infers from this sectional use of the divine names a difference of authorship for the respective portions of Genesis. He refers us to Exodus vi, 3, where God tells Moses that he had not shown his name Jahveh to the patriarchs. Consequently the author of that passage cannot be the author of the Jahvistic portions in Genesis.

Catholic authorities differ on the question whether the alleged passage of Exodus really proves the entire absence of the name Jahveh in pre-Mosaic times. S. Basil, Theodoretus, S. Gregory the Great, a Lapide, Calmet, Tirinus, Haneberg and others agree with Josephus [1] in denying that the divine name Jahveh was known before Moses. But Cajetan, Lyranus, Sixtus Senensis, Tostatus, Bonfrere, Allioli, Welte, Reinke and Corluy have found sufficient reason to hold the opposite view. The grounds on which this second opinion rests are the following:

1.—The name Jahveh enters as a component part into two pre-Mosaic names, "Jochebed," the name of Moses' mother, and "Moriah," the appellative of the sacrificial mountain. Cardinal Franzelin is of opinion that the name of Moses' mother was changed from "Elichebed" to "Jochebed" after the revelation of the name Jahveh. Whatever may be thought of this view, no

1 Antiquit. ii, 12, 14.

such change has taken place in the name "Moriah." For this word is explained in the very chapter in which it occurs as referring to Jahveh.[1]

2.—Without insisting on the fact that Jahveh is derived from a pre-Mosaic verbal form, its frequent occurrence in the earliest writings cannot be passed over in silence. The name occurs in the narrative parts of Genesis 116 times, in the recitative portions of the book 49 times. To eliminate all these occurrences from Genesis by substituting everywhere Elohim or any other divine name in its place, is considered too violent a measure even by the defenders of the Mosaic origin of the name Jahveh. But the proleptic use of the name, especially in the recitative parts, appears to be equally unnatural.

3.—The text parallel to Exodus vi. 3 demands that the name Jahveh should have been known before Moses. For when Moses asked God which divine name should be, as it were, the credential to his divine mission, God answered.[2] "I am who am. Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: He who is (Jahveh) hath sent me to you." But what authority could Moses have derived from an appeal to the divine name Jahveh, if it had been unknown to the Hebrews? Consequently, the name Jahveh must have been known in pre-Mosaic times.

For explaining the sectional change of the divine names throughout Genesis and the first chapters of Exodus, it is of very little importance, whether the name Jahveh was known before the time of Moses, or originated in the words of God speaking to Moses in the burning bush. In either case, Wellhausen and his school deduced from the above fact a plurality of authors for the book of Genesis and the whole Hexateuch. The only difference in our position resulting from the pre-Mosaic existence of the name Jahveh is, that on this hypothesis we too may more easily admit a plurality of authors of Genesis, in a sense explained by Mr. Smith.[3]

"Although Moses reduced the Pentateuch to writing, we are not to suppose, that he was the original author of everything in it. Former generations, far back in antiquity, had naturally written down and preserved the records of past events . . . It would be no matter for astonishment, if we found him incorporating with his own original materials documents from elsewhere, adapting, cur-

1 Cf. Gen. xxii, 2, 14. 2 Exod. iii, 13, f.

3 The book of Genesis or the Pentateuch in its authorship. London, 1868, pp. 21, ff.

tailing, extending, translating, as Livy does whole passages of Polybius without acknowledgment."

But even granting all this, Moses still remains the author of Genesis in its present form. Hence the question recurs, why did Moses call the deity by one name in one passage and by another name in another passage. The occurrence of the same name in whole sections, and its apparently systematic change in other sections, call for a more satisfactory explanation than is given by the accidental difference of authorship. The late Professor Delitzsch seems to have pointed to the right solution of our question when he said that the systematic change of the divine name implies rather a difference of purpose in the one author than a plurality of authors. On a closer examination the same writer discovered that Elohim is the God who creates and preserves nature, El-Shadday is the God who subdues nature so as to make it do what is apparently against its laws, and Jahveh is the author of the new creation of grace and of the supernatural order.

A few instances will both prove and illustrate Delitzsch's theory. The Pentateuch tells us of three special covenants which God concluded with man; the covenant with Noe, the covenant with the patriarchs and the covenant with the people of Israel.[1] The first of these covenants is nothing but a pledge on the part of God that the interrupted course of nature shall be restored, and preserved in future; it is, therefore, concluded in the divine name Elohim. The second covenant with the patriarchs is concluded in the divine name "El-Shadday," because in it the laws of nature are fully subjected to the divine omnipotence; the third covenant with the people of Israel implies the establishment of the supernatural order, and is, therefore, concluded in the sacred name Jahveh. The occurrence of Jahveh in the previous covenants had been merely casual, and pointed to the future, third covenant.[2]

Delitzsch's theory explains also those passages of the Pentateuch in which Elohim and Jahveh follow one another very closely. To say that such passages indicate the combination of various documents into one narrative by a later compiler, is to introduce an hypothesis both arbitrary and unsatisfactory. To be consistent, we should be obliged to separate not only chapter from chapter and verse from verse, but we should have to tear clause from

1 Gen. ix, 17; xvii, 1, ff.; Exod. vi, 3, ff.; iii, 14 ff.; cf. Gen. xiv, 18-20.; xxviii, 3. xxxi, 13; xvi, 13; xxi, 33.

2 Cf. Gen. xvii. 6; xxviii, 13.

clause, word from word, assigning the first half of a sentence to one writer and the second half to another, ascribing one word to the Jahvist and another to the Elohist; and, after all this ingenuity and labor, we are not able to form out of the various sections obtained by such a minute analysis, narratives that are in any way complete enough to be ascribed to distinct authors.

These inconveniences vanish, if we ascribe the change of the divine names in Genesis and the first six chapters of Exodus, to different aims and ends of the author rather than to a compilation of many documents. Genesis xvii, *e. g.*, begins: "And after he began to be ninety and nine years old, Jahveh appeared to him, and said unto him: I am El-Shadday, walk before me and be perfect." The rest of the chapter is Elohistic. Exodus vi, 2, 3, gives us the key to this apparently arbitrary use of divine names. "And Jahveh spoke to Moses saying: I am Jahveh that appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob by the name of El-Shadday; and my name Jahveh I did not show to them." The author of Genesis xvii shows us, therefore, by his use of the divine names that the thaumaturgus, El-Shaddy, who makes his covenant with the patriarchs, is identical with the creator, Elohim, and the sanctifier, Jahveh.

Take again Genesis vii, 16, where the entrance of the divers classes of animals into the ark is mentioned. "And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as Elohim had commanded him; and Jahveh shut him in on the outside." Elohim might have shut the ark; for such an act directly tended to preserve part of the created order. Still it is more fitting that Jahveh should perform this action, because Jahveh is pre-eminently the Saviour-God, who in the fullness of time walks on the raging waters of the sea to save his fearful disciples from a watery grave in the lake of Galilee. The same significant change of the divine name is observed in Noe's blessing.[1] Japhet is blessed in the name Elohim, while Sem receives his benediction in the name Jahveh; for Sem was the forefather of the supernaturally chosen people of God.

If it is hard to explain the occurrence of two or more different divine names in the same verse by the documentary hypothesis, it is still harder to explain by it the joint occurrence of different divine names. Such a *joint* occurrence of Jahveh-Elohim marks the whole passage, Gen. ii, 4–iii, 24. Only four times does Elohim,

1 Gen. ix, 26, 27.

alone, stand in the said section. With Gen. ii, 4 the history of man begins; the first man is created, raised to the supernatural sonship, placed in the garden of Eden, subjected to his trial of obedience, found wanting, and, after receiving the promise of a future redeemer, driven out of paradise. No wonder then that Jahveh, the God of the supernatural order, appears here as the agent. But the author of Genesis must guard his people against the belief that Jahveh, the God of love, is different from Elohim, the God of power and majesty, the creator of heaven and earth. Hence he uses the double name Jahveh-Elohim twenty times, in narrating this episode of God's unspeakable goodness to man. In the same section Elohim occurs four times; but three of these instances are found in the tempting words of the serpent, and once the name comes from the lips of Eve, then on the point of yielding to the tempter.

Illustrations of a similar significant use of the divine name might be multiplied without number. Though, in many instances, Jahveh could have been used as effectively as Elohim, and *vice versa*, still, according to Moses' fundamental line of thought, Jahveh is invariably the God of the supernatural order, El-Shadday the God of miracles, and Elohim the God of nature. Reasoning from this point of view, Delitzsch has rightly inferred that in the Mosaic Theodicy the double name Jahveh-Elohim is the compend of universal history,

After understanding the peculiar meaning of the different divine names in the Pentateuch, we shall find less difficulty in investigating Moses' definition of God. From the nature of the Pentateuch it follows that we cannot expect to find anywhere in its pages a formal treatise on theology. Still the point now in question is explained in the Pentateuch more clearly and fully than in any other historical book. The above quoted passage of Exodus iii, 14, ff. is here most pertinent. In order, however, to appreciate it properly, we must keep in mind the following points:

1.—God names himself Jahveh not in a cursory and incidental way, as he sometimes says in the sacred text "I am the God of your fathers," but in a most emphatic and significant manner. To the question "what is his name?" the express answer is "I am who am," or "he who is" (Jahveh) is his name.

2.—These names "I am who am" or "he who is" (Jahveh) distinguish God from all false gods, and in general from all that is not God. And not only at the time of Moses, but also in all future time will

Jahveh be the distinctive name of God. "This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations," is the testimony of God himself. Hence Jahveh ("he who is") applies to God alone and always, and is therefore an essential characteristic of the godhead.

3.—Whether the name Jahveh expresses the essential definition of God or signifies merely an essential characteristic of the deity, in either case it predicates necessary and self-existing being of God. For if "I am" is an essential predicate of God, it is also a necessary predicate, since everything essential to a being is necessary to it. And in the same manner, if "I am" is an essential predicate of God, "I come into being" or "I shall be" can never be applied to him. Consequently, God must be self-existent.

The history of the name Jahveh and of its modified form, Jehovah, does not form part of the Mosaic Theodicy. The different meanings ascribed to Jahveh are more ingenious than true. The expression of the Apocalypse (1. 8), "who is, and who was, and who is to come," is rather a paraphrase than a literal interpretation of the name Jahveh. Its mystic explanation according to which it is said to signify both the mystery of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation, is nothing but a pious fancy. For the Hebrew letters י ה ו no more resemble the Father, Son and Holy Ghost or the Word Incarnate, than do the corresponding letters of our alphabet.

Proceeding now to an examination of the divine attributes, we must keep in mind their number and kind. One class of God's attributes regards his mode of being, another class his way of working. The first class contains both negative and positive attributes; the negative remove imperfections from God, such as composition, change and multiplicity; the positive attribute to him something real, such as perfection, goodness and infinity. The attributes which concern God's way of working affect his intellect, his will, or both intellect and will combined. Here belong knowledge, liberty, omnipotence and providence. We shall see that the author of the Pentateuch predicates all these attributes of God either implicitly, by naming him Jahveh, or explicitly, by connecting them with the name Jahveh.

The first imperfection which must be removed from God on account of his name Jahveh, is composition. The name implies God's simplicity, because it signifies that God is self-existing being. For in self-existing being there is neither physical nor logical composition, excluding as it does all physical or logical parts. For parts, to be

parts, must differ from one another, *i. e.*, they must not severally contain the whole essence of the compound. Now, whatever part we may imagine, in either the physical or the logical order, falls within the range of *being*, and consequently cannot be a part in self-existing *being*. Hence the self-existing being, Jahveh, cannot have any parts, but must be simple.

In the same manner, if God is self existing being, as Jahveh shows us he is, there is in him nothing merely potential, but he is purely actual. And since a thing is perfect in so far as it is actual, God must be most perfect. For, if any divine attributes were merely potential, Moses could not call God Jahveh, *i. e.*, a being essentially actual. This explains the argument of the Hebrew legislator in Genesis xviii, 1: "Jahveh appeared to him (Abraham), and said unto him: I am the almighty God, walk before me and be perfect."

Again, if God is Jahveh, he is the greatest good. For everything is good in so far as it is lovable or desirable. But we love or desire a thing only in so far as it is perfect (or conceived to be perfect). Hence, God being most perfect, is also most lovable and desirable, and consequently the greatest good. This agrees with what we read in Exodus xxxiii, 19, 23; where God first promises Moses: "I will show thee all good," and then placing him in the hole of a rock, shows him the divine glory.

But we must also remember the other words spoken by God on the same occasion: "Thou canst not see my face; for no man shall see my face and live." The same assertion is repeated in Deuteronomy iv, 12: "You heard the voice of his words, but you saw not any form at all," and again in Deuteronomy iv, 15, 16: "You saw not any similitude in the day that the Lord God spoke to you in Horeb from the midst of the fire: lest perhps, being deceived, you might make you a graven similitude, or image of male or female." From passages like these we rightly infer that God's invisibility was well known to Moses.

Returning now to our train of reasoning, we maintain in the third place, that if God is Jahveh, he is also infinite in his perfection. Infinite perfection is nothing but a limitless perfection; but Jahveh, or the self-existing being, possesses limitless perfection, because he essentially embraces all being, and therefore, all perfection. The same follows from the fact that Jahveh is a necessary being. For a necessary being, in so far as it is necessary, cannot be merely potential, but must be actual, *i. e.*, must actually possess all the perfec-

tion that it possibly can possess. But it can possess all simple perfections without limit, as their very definition implies. Hence a necessary being actually possesses all perfections without limit, *i. e.*, it is infinite in perfection. What Moses says implicitly of God by naming him Jahveh, the Psalmist declares expressly.[1] "Great is Jahveh, and greatly to be praised; and of his greatness there is no end."

God's immensity and ubiquity are also implicitly contained in his name Jahveh. By immensity is meant the property of having an immeasurable presence in space. Now presence in space is measured either by quantity or by force. As to God, he has no quantity on account of his simplicity. Hence the measure of his presence in space is determined by the extent of his power. The latter being infinite, the divine presence in space too is without limit, *i. e.*, God is immense. The ubiquity of God, or his intimate presence in every creature, is inferred from his name, Jahveh, in the following way: Jahveh implies God's simplicity, and therefore the identity of his power and essence. On the other hand, it implies also the presence of God's power in every creature, since the very being of the creature must be preserved by the divine power. And since there is nothing more intimately present to a thing, than its being, it follows that God's power too is most intimately present to every creature; and if his power, his essence too is present with the same unspeakable closeness of union. Moses has stated this conclusion in Deuteronomy iv, 39: "Know, therefore, this day and think in thy heart that Jahveh is God in heaven above, and in the earth beneath, and there is no other."

Thus far we have seen that the name Jahveh implies in God the absence of all composition, and the presence of perfection, goodness, infinity, invisibility, omnipresence and immensity. In the second place, Jahveh implies the absence of all mutability in God. The inference is drawn most clearly by Malachy iii, 6: "I am Jahveh, and I change not." The conjunction translated in this text by "and" has not only a conjunctive meaning, but is also illative. The text of Malachy may therefore be rendered in strict scholastic form: I am Jahveh; therefore I change not. The conclusion clearly follows from the premise. For no change can take place, where there is nothing potential; but Jahveh implies a purely actual being, having nothing potential. Consequently Jahveh cannot change. But Moses is not content with stating only implicitly this

1. Ps. cxliv, 3.

attribute of God's immutability. In Exodus iii, 15, we are expressly told: "This (Jahveh) is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." Therefore God will be for ever a self-existing and a necessary being. Again in Deuteronomy vii, 9, we read: "Jahveh thy God, he is God; the faithful God which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations." As therefore God is God, because he is Jahveh, so he is faithful, because he is Jahveh. The same unchangeableness of God's will is asserted in Numbers xxiii, 19: "God is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of a man that he should repent."

From what has been said God's eternity may be immediately inferred. The schoolmen say, that God by reason of his eternity, has the simultaneous possession of his total duration. But God by reason of his immutability possesses now all that he ever has possessed and will or can possess, and is consequently eternal, *i. e.*, successionless in duration. It is, therefore, with a special significance that Moses tells us in Genesis xxi, 33: "But Abraham . . . called upon the name of Jahveh, God eternal." Jahveh is therefore by Moses himself either identified with "God eternal," or placed in an illative connection with it.

The third imperfection which the name Jahveh removes from God is multiplicity. Moses is explicit on the question of monotheism. In Deuteronomy iv, 35, he says: "Jahveh is God, and there is no other beside him." Again in the same chapter v, 39: "Jahveh is God in heaven above, and in the earth beneath, and there is no other." We have already drawn attention to the illative force of the conjunction "and." In both passages then God's unity is directly inferred from his name Jahveh. The inference is a logical one. For Jahveh implies both a simple and an infinite being. But neither a simple nor an infinite being can be multiplied. Hence Jahveh implies the unity of its subject. That neither a simple nor an infinite being can be multiplied follows from the fact that if either were multiplied, its individuating note too would have to be multiplied—now in a simple being this note is identical with the essence, and an infinite being would cease to be infinite in case it did not possess the individuating note of another infinite being outside of it. Hence if either a simple or an infinite being were multiplied, we should have several simple and infinite beings, all of which would be the same being. God then could truly say in Deuteronomy xxxii, 39: "See ye that I alone am, and there is no

other God besides me; I will kill, and I will make to live; I will strike, and I will heal, and there is none that can deliver out of my hand."

We now turn from the attributes affecting God's essence to those that regard his way of working. Here, too, we follow the leadership of Moses. Jahveh implies a God infinite in his perfections, and, therefore, infinite in knowledge and science. But, besides thus implicitly acknowledging a divine science, the Pentateuch states in several passages expressly that God possesses a surpassing amount of knowledge. The serpent's promise in Genesis iii, 5, points to divine knowledge of good and evil, which far exceeds that of our first parents. After the fall God himself testifies: "Lo Adam is become as one of us knowing good and evil." Again, the Pentateuch ascribes to God the knowledge of future things. For it was by God's inspiration that Joseph foretold the future to the servants of Pharaoh[1] and to Pharaoh himself.[2] By the same divine help did Balaam prophecy the future blessings of Israel.[3] The dying Jacob too,[4] and the expiring Moses,[5] are enabled, by God's assistance, to know the national fate of their people. Moses expressly promises[6] in the name of Jahveh that a prophet like himself will arise in the midst of the chosen people, and the true prophet is to be distinguished from the false by this sign: "Whatsoever that same prophet foretelleth, in the name of Jahveh, and it cometh not to pass that thing Jahveh hath not spoken, but the prophet hath forged it by the pride of his mind."[7]

Moses' testimony for God's free will is equally clear and decisive. The Pentateuch[8] represents God as deliberating before creating man; as influenced by the prayers of Abraham interceding for the cities of the plain;[9] as repenting of having made man on the earth,[10] and as capable of free choice.[11] Now, a being able to deliberate before acting, and to act or not to act at the pleading of another, able to repent of past actions, and to choose freely the future course of action, is undoubtedly possessed of free will. Moses then agrees in this point too with the Psalmist,[12] "Whatsoever Jahveh pleased,

1 Gen. xl, 8, 12, 18. 2 Gen. xli, 25, ff.
3 Num. xxiii, 7-10; 15-24; xxiv, 1-10; 15-24. 4 Gen. xlix, 1-27.
5 Deut. xxxiii. 6 Deut. xvi, 15.
7 Deut. xviii, 22; Cf. Exod. vii, 1-4; xxxiii, 17; Gen. xviii, 19; xxii, 12.
8 Gen. i, 26. 9 Gen. xviii, 20-23. 10 Gen. vi, 6.
11 Deut. iv, 37; vii, 6, 7; x, 15; xii, 5, 11, 14, 18, 21; xiv, 2, 23, ff; xv, 20; xvi, 2, 6, f, 11, 15, 16; xvii, 8, 10, 15; xviii, 5, 6; xxi, 5; xxiii, 16; xxvi, 2; xxx, 19; xxxi, 11.
12 Cxxxiv, 6.

he hath done, in heaven, in earth, in the sea, and in all the depths."

Nor does Moses conceive God as capable of immanent action only. The God of Moses is pre-eminently active in his creatures. The third chapter of Genesis identifies the Creator of heaven and earth with Jahveh; Jahveh opens the floodgates of heaven[1] and destroys everything on the face of the earth; he rains fire and brimstone on the impure cities of the plain,[2] on the summit of Mount Sinai he appears in a cloud of fire and smoke,[3] and the foundations of the earth tremble at his approach. With this view of the power of God agree the words of Deuteronomy iii, 24, "Jahveh God, thou hast begun to show unto thy servant thy greatness and most mighty hand; for there is no other God either in heaven or earth, that is able to do thy works, or to be compared to thy strength," and also the words of Deuteronomy xxxii, 39: "See ye that I alone am, and there is no other God besides me; I will kill, and I will make to live; I will strike and I will heal, and there is none that can deliver out of my hand." The testimony of Moses is therefore in full accord with the dictates of reason, telling us that God's power must be limitless, as all his perfections are infinite.

Nor does the Pentateuch represent Jahveh as a mere prodigy of intellect and of resistless will-power. The hymn of Moses [4] celebrating the goodness of God is one continuous testimony of God's loving care for his faithless children. "As an eagle that stirreth up her nest, that fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her pinions: (so) the Lord alone did lead him (Jacob), and there was no strange god with him. He made him ride on the high places of the earth, and he did eat the increase of the field: and he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock." The history of the people in the desert is again one continuous testimony to God's ever watching providence. He feeds the Israelites with manna and gives them living water from the rock; he saves them from the hands of the pursuing Egyptians, and leads them into the promised land; he makes them victorious over their numberless enemies and shows them more than a brother's love or a parent's affection. "From the evening there was over the tabernacle as it were the appearance of fire until the morning; so it was always: by

1 Gen. vii, 4, 11.
2 Gen. xix, 24.
3 Exodus xix, 16.
4 Deuteronomy xxxii.

day the cloud covered it,[1] and by night as it were the appearance of fire. And when the cloud that covered the Tabernacle was taken up, then the children of Israel marched forward: and in the place where the cloud stood still, there they camped. At the command of the Lord they marched and at his command they pitched the Tabernacle."[2]

It is owing to this same love of God for his people that Moses dares to speak of him as if he were a mere man. For man is made after God's image and likeness ; [3] God fears, [4] is angry, [5] and repents as man might do.[6] God's holiness is the model of human holiness. [7] God's justice is man's strongest incentive to do good and avoid evil;[8] but at the same time, "the Lord God is merciful and gracious, patient and of much compassion, and true," [9] and he keepeth mercy unto thousands, and taketh away iniquity and wickedness and sins.[10]

The Pentateuchal theology contains even traces of the divine decrees regarding the distribution of efficacious grace. In Exodus vii. 3, 4 God foretells the obstinacy of Pharaoh : "I shall harden his heart," God says, "and shall multiply my signs and wonders in the land of Egypt."[11] On the other hand, God really wished that Pharaoh should dismiss his people Israel. For "Jahveh said to Moses: Go in to Pharaoh, and speak to him : Thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews: Let my people go to sacrifice to him."[12] But even Pharaoh's hardness of heart serves to promote God's glory. "Therefore have I raised thee, that I may show my power in thee, and my name may be spoken of throughout the earth."[13]

If it be asked whether the author of the Pentateuch knew the mystery of the Holy Trinity, we must distinguish between what he knew and what he wrote on this subject. We believe it true beyond all doubt that God had revealed the mystery in question to Moses, as a private person. But in Moses' writings we find hardly more than traces of the same truth. Those theologians who argue on this point from the plural form of the divine name "Elohim," must remember that the plurality of persons in every one whom they address with "you," may be established by the same method of reasoning.

1 The Tabernacle.
2 Numbers ix, 15-18; Cf. Gen. xx, 6; xlv, 8; l, 20; Exod. xii, 46; Numb. ix, 12.
3 Gen. i, 26. 4 Gen. ii, 22, 23; Exod. xiii, 17. 5 Deut. xxii, 21.
6 Gen. vi, 6, 7. 7 Lev. xix, 2; Exod. xv, 11.
8 Gen. ii, 17; xviii, 25; Exod. xx, 5; xxxiv, 7; Deut. vii, 9, 13, 12; xxvii, 25; xxxii, 4.
9 Exod. xxxiv, 6. 10 Ibid. v, 7.
11 Cf. Exod. ix, 12. 12 Exod. ix, 1. 13 Exod. ix, 16.

The passages "let us make men after our image," [1] "man is become as one of us," [2] and "let us go down," [3] are more to the point. Still even they contain at best but hints. No number of persons is indicated, no single person is named, so that their particular relations remain veiled in complete mystery. The threefold address in Numbers vi. 24-26, "the Lord bless thee and keep thee; the Lord shew his face to thee and have mercy on thee; the Lord turn his countenance to thee, and give thee peace," may contain the mysteries of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation; but without a new revelation neither mystery can be deduced from it.

The passages of the Pentateuch in which God is distinguished from God as subject from object, if we may use these expressions while treating the present question, bear more directly on our inquiry. Agar says to "the angel (messenger) of the Lord:" [4] "Thou the God, who hast seen me." [5] Consequently, she ascribes divinity to one sent by Jahveh. [6] Again, one of the three men appearing to Abraham [7] is called Adonai, Jahveh, Judge of all the earth, and Abraham confesses to be but dust and ashes before him. [8] The same person remains with Abraham who pleads the case of Sodom and Gomorrha before him. In the following chapter Gen. xix, 2, the two persons who had left Jahveh and Abraham in order to go to Sodom, are no longer called "men" but "angels"; they themselves now declare to have been sent by Jahveh. [9] But in the same chapter divinity is at least implicitly ascribed to these two angels or messengers. [10] We infer therefore from Genesis xviii and xix that there are three divine persons, two of whom may be conceived as being sent. This result fully agrees with Christian theology: only two persons can be said to be sent, because mission implies inferiority, and among the divine persons there is no inferiority excepting by reason of origin; hence only God the Son and the Holy Ghost can be conceived as being sent.

Without ascribing to Moses a scientific or theological knowledge of the divine essence and attributes, and persons, we may safely maintain that his knowledge of God was much wider and deeper than is commonly believed, especially by the students of Comparative Religion. But far from astonishing us, Moses' divine insight, as manifested throughout the Pentateuch, rather agrees with what we

1 Gen. i, 26. 2 Gen. iii, 22. 3 Gen. ix. 7.
4 Gen. xvi, 6, 9. 10, 11. 5 Ibid. v, 13.
6 A messenger of the Lord. 7 Gen. xviii, 2.
8 Gen. xviii, 3, 13, 25, 27. 9 Ibid. v, 13. 10 vv, 15-22.

ought to expect in this regard according to God's own testimony, solemnly given to Aaron and Mary: [1] "Hear my words: if there be among you a prophet of the Lord, I will appear to him in a vision, or I will speak to him in a dream. But it is not so with my servant Moses, who is most faithful in all my house: for I speak to him mouth to mouth; and plainly and not by riddles and figures doth he see the Lord."

A. J. MAAS, S. J.

---

## QUOMODO CANTABIMUS?

How shall we sing the song of the Lord in a strange land?
Ps. 136, 4.

IN a preceding paper we pictured in outline some of the prominent features of the argument for congregational singing. This could have been more justly presented in many papers; but in that form it might have lost much of its collective force. Besides, we pointed out that congregational song is a corollary so plainly deducible from the history of sacred music, from its nature and scope, and from the sad enough incongruities inherent in its present status, as scarcely to brook a demonstration rather than a mere statement of its truth.

Nevertheless, while all may cheerfully concede the truth of this corollary in theory, they are rather few who seem willing to give to its practical accomplishment the requisite expenditure of time and money and trouble, from the mistaken idea that such expenditure must be great both in itself and in relation to the good it would accomplish. Besides, there are doubtless many who think the project visionary in the extreme, except for those peculiarly favored corners of the Lord's vineyard where an abundance of laborers and the necessary tools, as well as a gracious downpouring of Heaven's dews and blessed warmth of Heaven's sunshine, can easily prophesy of harvests in due season. In this article, therefore, the subject shall be closed with some suggestions and some discussion of a practical character looking to a rehabilitation of congregational singing in our churches.

1 Numbers xii, 6.

I

We have been contending thus far for the principle of congregational singing. It contemplates having the people sing as much and as often as possible; and therefore, as far as the Church will permit, in the vernacular. The scope is very ample. In its ideal fulfillment, it would solve forever the present vexing questions concerning "our choir;" it would do away with all that choir's vanities and vexation of spirit; it would bring decency and order into the back part of the church edifice by the radical process of either tearing down the gallery there, or filling it with pews for the faithful; it would reduce the "late" Mass and the Vesper "service" (a necessary substantive, since the virtual abolishing of the liturgical *vespers* by "our choir,") to a decent time-limit; it would permit the celebrant to preserve intact the continuity of the Canon of the Mass; it would free his patient soul forever of the inevitable and inalienable distresses born of his "volunteer"—nay, of his paid—"men singers and women singers;" it would—but the chapter is too long, and suggests too sad a congeries of horrors, for us to continue. In fine, in its ideal form we should not only have priests and people a liturgical unit, but we should also have the people, in those services which the Rubrics do not provide for, and which they do not even contemplate, a congregational unit, praising God with one heart and one voice.

In its widest application, then, it would suppose that *all* the liturgical chants except the *accentus* of the sacred ministers, and, probably, those *Graduale* chants which, being of less frequent occurrence, might not be easily learned by the people, should be sung by the whole congregation. We are speaking now of the strictly liturgical song, which, of course, must be in the Latin tongue. It supposes further, however, that all services, such as the "low" Masses, the "Benediction" down at least to the *Tantum Ergo*, and the many other more private devotions permitted or prescribed by the Ordinary, should afford opportunity for hymns in the vernacular. The limits to the use of the vernacular are laid down in the following decrees of the Congregation of Rites, quoted from Wapelhorst.[1] Prohibitum est cantare lingua vulgari inter Missarum solemnia (S. R. C. 10 Dec. 1870, S. Hyacinthi; n. 5466; et alia plura Decr.). At "attenta consuetudine toleratur usus, carmina vulgari sermone cantandi coram SS. Sacramento exposito et in ejusdem processione (S. R. C. 27 Sept. 1864, De Nicaragua, n.

[1] § 98, n. 6.

5336, 7); immo generaliter "possunt cantores coram SS. Sacramento solemniter exposito decantare hymnos in lingua vernacula, dummodo non agatur de hymnis *Te Deum* et aliis liturgicis precibus." (S. R. C. 27 Febr. 1882, Leavenworthen. Cfr. n. 218, 11.) This last he gives in full.[1] "Utrum liceat generaliter ut chorus musicorum (id est cantores), coram SSmo. Sacramento solemniter exposito decantet hymnos in lingua vernacula? Resp. Posse: dummodo non agatur de hymnis *Te Deum* et aliis quibuscumque liturgicis precibus, quae nonnisi latina lingua decantari debent;" and adds: nec licet ista decantare infra ipsam Benedictionem post *Tantum Ergo* inchoatum (Cfr. Instr. past. Alt. a. 1880). With regard to Vespers, the second Plenary Council of Balt. decrees: Noverint (sc. the rectors of churches) juxta Ecclesiae ritum carmina vernaculo idiomate inter Missarum solemnia vel vesperas solemnes decantare non licere (361).

II.

The practical limits, then, to the use of the vernacular in the hymns are the Solemn Mass and the Divine Office (Vespers and Compline in practice), and the *Benediction* after *Tantum Ergo* has been begun. With this broad line of distinction between Latin and English texts clearly in view, we have the question of difficulty in introducing congregational singing set squarely before us.

Thus much for the ideal Church song. In practice, we must be content to accept a varying and a lower standard. For the objection is immediately made that both the plain chant of our Liturgical offices and the strangeness of the Latin idiom and pronunciation offer insuperable barriers in our progress towards the ideal. Again it is objected that well-meant efforts to bring about even a common vernacular song must be baffled by the listlessness of the people; by the adverse criticism of those who have interests at stake, and of those whose "cultured" musical appreciation will not tolerate the rude surges of popular song; by the want, it may be, of a large and powerful organ "to lead the singing;" by the difficulty in securing competent teachers; by the added expense of a large supply of music books for the purpose; by the absence, amongst the largest proportion of the common people, of ears delicate enough to appreciate and apprehend musical intervals clearly, or of voices flexible enough and smooth enough to give pleasing utterance to musical sounds. So much shall we concede to these

[1] 218, 11.

objections, as not to insist very strenuously at present on our ideal. But we shall insist that the ideal is not impossible of attainment ultimately; and that even any approach toward it is commendable, and that near approaches to it are, in most parishes, not only not impossible, but of easy accomplishment. The principle should be urged here, not of *Aut Cæsar aut nihil*, but of the "half-loaf," and the "entering wedge."

There are, then, various degrees which, in different places and peculiar circumstances, might be accepted as a starting point. The lowest would perhaps be the singing by the whole congregation, of those old-time melodies which everybody may fairly be assumed to know—*e. g.*, the *Adeste Fideles*, the *Stabat Mater*, the *O Salutaris*, all of them in an English version. This would require neither effort nor expense, and might serve the useful purpose of demonstrating both that the people *can* sing and that they *like* to sing.

The next step would contemplate the use of English hymns at the early Masses, and at the various devotions. The next would suppose a Manual of Hymns with sufficient matter for a desirable variety of selections throughout the year. Next, the people would have but little difficulty in mastering the Latin pronunciation of the Responses at High Mass and Vespers, the translation of which they have in their prayer-books. Indeed, it does not appear why they should find much more difficulty than the "choir," who are, after all, a *profanum vulgus* to the mysteries of Latin, in mastering the Vespers. The next step might be a simple unison "Mass" in modern tonality, which could be sung, like Masses in Plain Chant, antiphonally, either by having the centre aisle as a division, or by having the congregation sing alternately with a select body of singers. The next step would have a select choir learn the *Graduale* chants, either in Gregorian (which would be best), or set to a simple modern melody, or sung "modo psalmorum." The highest grade would, of course, have the liturgical chants sung in Gregorian, would have a "proper" and integral Vespers for every Sunday, and a large repertoire of English hymns for different devotions. What should we then have? We should then have, as of old, "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people," (I Pet. 2, 9), speaking to themselves "in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in" their "hearts to the Lord." (Eph. 5, 9.)

III.

In the preceding section some objections to the possibility of training the whole congregation to sing have been presented, to which a few brief answers will be given here. And first of all, with regard to the listlessness of the people, let us quote from "a good contrapuntist and musician," the Rev. Arthur Bedford, who in his book "The Great Abuse of Music," published in 1711, speaks of the good effects of the Protestant congregational singing in the small country places of England: "The good effects of divine music are evident from many places in the country where the inhabitants learn to sing psalms in consort, though from a mean artist. Common experience tells us that such singing of psalms in many country places hath wonderfully increased the congregations."[1] If our people should indeed prove listless, this cannot be charged to natural apathy, but to the languor of a diseased tradition which has made a separate caste of singers, and the rest of the "holy nation" pariahs.

A bad custom must be overcome by a good custom. And experience shows us that no worthy project when fairly and earnestly proposed to our people lacks a hearty co-operation on their part. "Let us hear what the Very Rev. J. J. Power, V. G. the rector of St. Paul's, Worcester, has to say: '1. My congregation still like their singing work. 2. They have improved and are improving weekly. 3. The attendance at Vespers is now *three times* what it used to be. 4. I have had a rehearsal every Friday night since you were here, and we have some rousing choruses. 5. They are learning 'O Salutaris,' 'Tantum Ergo,' and 'Laudate Dominum.' I could go on and make other points down to 13thly, but the above will suffice to show you that we are not asleep, and have not yet tired of the work. I enjoy it as much as they do.'" Thus Father Young quotes the approbation of the movement by his reverend correspondent, and instances similar success in other localities, both East and West. So far then are the people from being listless that it should rather be said of them that they are eager for the opportunity of joining in the public song of praise.

"But their harsh voices would make the singing intolerable." In answer, let us quote again from the Rev. Arthur Bedford: "Though fine music is expected at a fine concert, yet in country places it is very grateful to hear the meanest voices setting forth the glory of God in such psalms and hymns as are truly, though not finely, performed, and the harmony of many voices drowns that

1 In Curwen's Studies in Worship Music, p. 8.

harshness which is very perceivable in one." Outside of this musical answer, we might well urge that the people are not singing to please chance auditors, or each other, or even themselves, but the ear of heaven. They are singing to praise Him who, where even two or three shall be gathered together in His name, is in the midst of them ; and why should not the unequal voices of sire and son, of matron and maiden

> In one devotion blend
> To speak the soul's eternal want
> Of Him, the inmost friend ;
> One prayer soars cleansed with Martyr fire,
> One choked with sinner's tears,
> In heaven both meet in one desire,
> And God one music hears.

When a large number of voices can be depended upon to sing a melody in unison, not only are the individual peculiarities of sharpness, roughness, etc., lost in the round and full unison, but even the incorrect and slovenly intonation, the "flatting" and "sharping" of a few voices here and there will be scarcely perceptible. And even if an occasional downright discord grates on the musical sense, might we not quote Lowell further in apology ?

> My dream is shattered, yet who knows
> But in that heaven so near
> These discords find harmonious close
> In God's atoning ear ?

And next comes the plea that the organ is not powerful enough "to lead the chorus," and that the church funds are too low to promise anything in the matter of providing a new organ. But we need only point to the fact that the organ is quite young compared to congregational singing ; and while history shows us, therefore, that it can by no means be considered a necessary adjunct to "worship-music," experience demonstrates that very often it is worse than useless. Even in the last century the instrument was to be found only in a few large churches in England, where, nevertheless, congregational singing had flourished without its assistance. The decline in such music might be ascribed perhaps as much to the organ as to the want of it. Curwen refers to the complaints urged by a musician, William Riley, in that century, against the misuse of organs. "Turning to organists, Riley complains of the tedious va-

riety in every line, of the ill-timed flourishes, which put the congregation out, of the full organ being too loud for the voices, and of the shake at the end of every line, which is given even when it causes a break in the sense. He quotes this verse—

> The Lord's commands are righteous and (shake)
> Rejoice the heart likewise,
> His precepts are most pure and do (shake)
> Give light unto the eyes,

to show the absurdity and irreverence which the shake sometimes introduces. He notices that organists often play interludes in common time to psalm-tunes in triple time. He complains of the levity of style in voluntaries, and mentions incidently that some recommend the use of five or six tunes only." *Mutatis mutandis* we have a pretty true portrait of many an organist of this highly cultured age of ours. It cannot of course be denied that the organ is an auxiliary of greatest service in sustaining a rich volume of sound, in determining the pitch of a melody to be sung, in indicating the varying *tempo* for different musical selections and for different parts of the same piece, and in broadly marking the "expression." On the other hand, however, it may be fairly questioned whether the organ has not, as a matter of fact, contributed rather to the decline than to the progress of sacred music. There are organists *and* organists; and such a powerful weapon should not be lightly put into profane hands. While, then, a good organ could be of much assistance, it is by no means necessary. Indeed, a pitch-pipe would answer well enough for determining the pitch of the melody, and a good strong chorus of the better-voiced and better-trained amongst the congregation could be formed into a special choir, and could determine the *tempo* and *expression* for the rest of the congregation.

Then there are the critics whose Sunday free concert will be so seriously minimized! We shall answer them with what they must consider an argumentum ad absurdum: we shall put *Plain Chant* even, in the balance with modern music, and watch the tipping of the scales. Says the Rt. Rev. Louis Lootens, D. D., in his introduction to "Extracts from the Roman Gradual, etc.:" "It is a very great mistake to suppose that Catholics in general are in favor of modern music in the church. We imagine, perhaps not without reason, we ought to know something about Catholic countries and practices. The introduction of music has often been the work of a few individuals, sometimes of the leader of a choir, sometimes of a

pastor whose taste lay that way ; and who, if he had consulted the real interests of religion, and weighed the whole thing in the scales of the sanctuary, would have hesitated, to say the least, before he committed himself to the change. In the city in which the writer was born, the offices of the Church were about equally divided between modern music and Gregorian chant. On the great festivals of the year, the music was very grand and very artistically performed. And yet it was a notorious fact, that on those days, many people who, on ordinary occasions, would not have, for any consideration, omitted going to High Mass, in their parish church, were satisfied with a Low Mass, or filled the convent churches or public oratories, and heard High Mass there. The reason they gave was, *that the music prevented them from praying*. We have heard such statements with our own ears. How little indeed do Protestants know about Catholic feelings ! and how far are they astray, when they imagine that the Church would lose her hold upon the ignorant and the uneducated, were she to be shorn of the exterior pomp of her ceremonial ! for the people for whom we are speaking are chiefly among the class just mentioned, and more than one of them had nothing but their beads to take with them to church."

But the cultured classes? The High Mass with its sublime *Kyries*, *Glorias*, *Credos*, etc. ? The truth is that those critics who really know what good music is, have sufficient taste to prefer being in at the death of a poor melody than at the slaughter of Haydn and Beethoven. Let us hear something from a thoroughly pronounced advocate of "modern music," Father Taunton, in his History and Growth of Church Music :[1] "I once heard somewhere in the South of England a choir, consisting of three women (two who were uncertain both in age and voice) and two men, getting through Haydn No. 1. It was something awful ; and when I just mention the fact that the organist only played from "ear," it may be imagined what was the result. I was told beforehand that the choir was considered particularly good. The music they attempted undoubtedly is so, but the execution—poor Haydn !" O many a church in this land of ours, *mutato nomine de te fabula narratur !* The rarest exception in our churches is to hear *good music* (appropriate or not, *transeat*) well sung. The rule is to hear good music poorly sung, or a sad congeries of mild musical inanities of greatest length and ground out very, very slowly ! Give the writer any unison singing by an untrained mob rather than "the feeble-

1 P. 116.

ness and mild inanities of Webbe, Ett, Concone, Bordese, *et hoc genus omne.*" But even against the well-trained choir and its grand programmes will militate the objections urged in our former paper showing that congregational singing should be considered a corollary of the demonstration against "our choir."

Other objections will be indirectly answered in connection with the plans suggested for introducing congregational song into our churches. But possibly the best answer to objections of all kinds is to point to the evident success of this movement, even in localities where such objections receive their most peculiar accentuation. Lord Dundreary's speculation as to what his letter might contain and who sent it were doubtless very entertaining, but nevertheless not quite as satisfactory as the simple process of breaking the seal and reading. *Ab esse ad posse*, as Father Young pertinently remarks, *valet illatio.* In such a practical matter, syllogisms and theoretical demonstrations are hardly requisite for the "proof of the pudding."

## IV.

The question, then, is not one of possibility; for in many places this has been settled by the definite adoption and success of congregational singing. The "method" to be followed in getting our people to sing is the one question that concerns us now, and that question resolves itself in great measure into one merely of *will.* "Where there's a will there's a way" is true here almost in its literal acceptation. First of all, there is not *one* method. The work is so simple as to defy any laborious attempt at systematizing; and therefore any one who sees the end clearly may select his own path thither, careless of guide or guide-book. Let us quote again from Father Young: "I can do no better than explain what may be called the 'method' I have adopted in teaching, a method so simple that I would despair of getting a patent for it, and if I could I wouldn't, for I hate quacks and all patent nostrums. In the first place the people must be amply supplied with hymn-books, each person having his own . . . Let the pastor go into the pulpit, and by a few plain, earnest words impress upon the people that God has given them voices to sing His praises, and that He is waiting to hear them . . . If the pastor be a singer he can do the teaching himself. If not, let him have the assistance of a singing leader, who should stand in an elevated position so as to be seen by all. Then he or the leader, as the case may be, reads over the first

verse of the 'beautiful' hymn they are to learn . . . If there is an organ, bid the organist now play over the whole tune distinctly, requesting the people to listen very attentively. Then say: 'Now listen to me while I sing over the first line, and the instant I finish it I will sing it over again, and everyone with a tongue in his head will sing the same with me' . . . Always make it a point to praise and never find fault. Then go on. 'Now listen while I sing the second line which you will repeat as before with me.' . . . The third and fourth are to be treated in like manner, and the lesson is over: for now, the whole verse is readily sung. Then get them on their feet. That brings out a double volume of tone . . . You will find it child's play to teach the other verses of the hymn . . . be sure to preserve a confident tone and manner, manifesting your own assurance of success." He insists on an earnest, urgent presentation to the people of the motive—"*all this is for God and to please Him.*"

To establish thoroughly and to perpetuate the work, he suggests a weekly rehearsal by the children in school of the hymns taught to the congregation; and a weekly rehearsal by the whole congregation. "A select choral society of young men and young women would be a great help. These could meet on another evening and be taught something of musical notation, learning also some good, healthy-toned choral pieces other than the hymns for their vocal exercise and innocent diversion. But such members should be held to the obligation of attending all the general rehearsals for the people, as also the regular services . . . they should not sit together in church, but should scatter themselves about as they might if no such society existed. 'For the praise of God,' must be the sole motto."

## V.

In this condensed presentation of Father Young's "method," the reasons he gives for the various steps indicated have been omitted, that space might be left for presenting some suggestions of others on our general subject. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Vaughan of Salford,[1] speaks of how his people were attracted by the introduction into the cathedral of "a selection in the vernacular, of psalms, hymns and antiphons, with short night prayers, all set to simple and attractive music. The effect was magical. The cathedral filled every night. The rector walked up and down the gangways

1 *Catholic World*, January, 1889.

encouraging the people to sing alternately with the body of singers in the sanctuary. The children of Mary naturally took the lead; and now with a good, powerful organ, the music is fairly drawn out of the whole congregation and is well sustained . . . The congregation of the cathedral is not what is called a wealthy or a highly educated congregation, but is made up almost exclusively of working-people and factory-hands . . . In many parts of England these English services for Sunday have been taken up with great effect. A practical way of getting over the difficulty in introducing them is the following:

Set the regular choir to practice them, get the Sunday-school, get the elder children and the day-school, get the children of Mary or any other confraternity, to practice them. Distribute the words among the congregation. Let a priest encourage the people to sing out by keeping tune for them, either in the pulpit or while walking up and down among them, until the whole congregation has been got thoroughly into the habit of singing. A powerful organ will after that keep them up and draw the music out of them without any difficulty. Above all things, enlist the interest and services of the younger members of the congregation . . . In some churches it will be found possible to divide the congregation itself, as it were, into two choirs, one side taking one verse of the psalm, and the other side the other. But as a general rule the easiest and simplest manner is to place a choir in the sanctuary, or even in the organ gallery, which shall take alternate parts with the congregation. A person, not necessarily a priest, will be required to lead and act as cantor, or, better still, there may be two cantors who will sing together. The prayers which are to be recited or sung in a monotone may be sung either by a priest or by a cantor."

## VI.

The introduction and thorough establishment of vernacular song in those devotions which do not require liturgically the use of Latin, would prove a good stepping-stone to the performance of the sublime Liturgy of the Church in its *fulness* at least, if not, indeed, clothed with that particular garment of song to which the Church has affixed her official sanction—the Gregorian Chant. No special plea is being urged here for that venerable song, for its beauty, its fitness, its simplicity. Whether we have the Plain Chant, or some simple modern melody, what is desirable

is that the Mass be chorally complete ; that the special character of every season and every festival be illustrated by the retention of the *Graduale* texts and Vesperal antiphons ; and that, slowly perhaps, but at all events ultimately, the people be encouraged to take a personal part in the rendition of these Latin texts, or at least of the Latin texts of the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, *etc.* The project is hardly visionary. But here we look for greatest assistance from "the rising generation." It has been well asked : "Can there be any incongruity more grievous than to enter a Catholic school, rich in every appliance of education, and to find that, in spite of the time, money, and method lavished on its support, its pupils are unable to understand and recite the Church Offices and are untrained to take part in Church psalmody?" To quote from Bishop Lootens : "How different the case is in countries where modern music has not curtailed our sacred Offices ! We shall again quote France . . . There every person goes to church, not with a book of private devotion, but with his *Paroissien* : that is, a complete collection of all the Offices of the Church, generally in Latin and French. As he follows every word that is sung by the choir, and as he hears the same thing over and over again, year after year, every festival takes its proper shape and forms its proper association in his mind."

We must, in this *terra aliena*, sing the "song of the Lord." *Quomodo cantabimus canticum Domini in terra aliena?* The centuried tradition which has been the heirloom of Catholic France, and which has made possible the beautiful custom of which Bishop Lootens speaks, must be for our children the tradition of a few years. But what need prevent the perpetuation of that tradition amongst a Catholic population whose obedience to Holy Church, whose self-sacrifice in building up unceasingly ever fresh temples to the worship of God, whose preservation of Catholic faith and the Catholic instinct amidst most adverse circumstances, shall not easily be surpassed even in the "ages of faith?" Must we yield forever to "the spirit of the times,"—forgetting that our race has always been the best when it retained most of its original God-given charter? No modern plateaus shall coax the stream of humanity higher than its fount. The best progress is the retrogression that should show us once more the Golden Age. And there is therefore much besides the weight of an official pronouncement in those oft-quoted words of the Baltimore Plenary Council : Valde exoptandum esse censemus ut rudimenta cantus Gregoriani in scholis parochialibus

exponantur et exerceantur sicque numero eorum qui psalmos bene cantare valent magis magisque, increscente, paulatim major saltem pars populi secundum primitivae Ecclesiae adhuc in variis locis vigentem usum vesperas et alia similia cum ministris et choro decantare addiscant. The Fathers look naturally to the parochial schools and, in doing so, point the road for us to follow in our efforts to introduce congregational performance of the choral parts of the Liturgy. If to the children you add a strong choral association in which the pronunciation of Latin could be taught, you have the elements of a good congregational service; and in a few years, as the children become the men and the women of the future, you will have a constantly increasing number, the *major saltem pars populi* of our quotation, joining in the sacred Offices, after the fashion of the primitive church.

VII.

We have been considering thus far *unison* singing. And as the purpose of congregational song is not artistic but devotional, we may refuse to concern ourselves with the pleas of musicians against it. People have been so educated to believe harmony a postulate of music, that even the exquisite strains which a *maestro* can draw from the violin sound, without any accompaniment, bald and empty to the common ear. And yet the best of music is melody; and the most wonderful developments of harmony, if they be not founded on melody, are a musical play-toy, fitted to excite our wonder and admiration, but wholly unable to move the heart, and to be "a joy forever."

Until these latter days, the history of music has been a history of melody—and the musical heresy of our days is the super-exaltation of harmony, and the woeful lack of "tune" in the latest artistic efforts. Thus much can be said from an artistic stand-point in defence of *unison* singing. It can, artistically, stand on its own *theoretical* merits. If the *fact* still remain, that unison congregational song destroys the essence of melody by its drawling, by its expressionless volume of sound, by its blending of harsh voices and different registers, we must attack not the theory, but the inartistic execution of the melody.

Now although we have been insisting on the *devotional* and not on the *artistic* value of the Church song, and have tried to show that *prayer*, and not *pleasure* should be the measure of its usefulness, it is a pleasant thing to know that this "artistic" objection may, by

the efforts of the pastor and people, lose most of its urgency. The people can be taught to sing with due regard to *tempo* and to expression, they can be taught how to use the voice properly, how to sing without screeching on the one hand, or humming on the other; they can be taught to sing joyful themes with a joyful accent, and sorrowful themes with a subdued melancholy. It is a question of some extra trouble, and time and patience.

It is not inconceivable that a harmonized melody be taught to the people with success. The thing has been done with great success in various Protestant churches. But whatever gain there may be in an artistic way, this is merely *ad ornamentum*, and we shall not consider it here, or the methods that have been followed with success in its establishment. The curious reader may find the subject treated in great detail in Mr. Curwen's "Studies in Worship Music," First and Second Series. But one suggestion might be made in this connection—namely, that if *unison* singing be our aim, the people be instructed to forego the delights of improvised harmony!

Thanks to the ability and the labor of two Priest musicians, we have a plentiful supply of material for the best congregational singing. "The Roman Hymnal," by Rev. J. B. Young, S. J. (Pustet and Co., N. Y. 1884) and "The Catholic Hymnal" by Rev. Alfred Young, C. S. P., (Cath. Pub. So. Co. N. Y. 1888) should be procured by all who are interested in this subject.

H. T. HENRY.

---

## A HOMILY ON HOMILETICS.

TEXT—MATH.-CH. XIII., VER. 15.

WITH hardly the faintest shade of a metaphor, it can be truthfully asserted that our age is almost suffocated in a deep, rose-dyed ocean of flattery. This condition of things has generated a sickly, effeminate sentimentalism which nauseates at truth when it flutters in its own sterling, native hues. It will have truth, if at all, only as it is properly masked under the rich, velvety crimson of adulation. Naturalness in the mode of the day is heartily voted vulgar; artificiality alone is fine or superfine as accords fittingly with grade and skilled contrivance. Culture so-called attempts to

disguise, or suppress, those disagreeable thoughts and things which it would, but cannot abolish. Men should be all heroes and paragons of perfection; all ladies impersonations of beauty and angels of light. Alas! both for the dream and for the dreamer! Mankind remains, despite the deafening revolutions of the maddened wheels of progress, the same fallen race that has clutched along the weary chain of the dead and vanished centuries, blackening and staining them with lusts and sins, ambitions and frailties. This rude, but real, aspect of humanity looks, and will continue so to look, out through the brightest artificial polish and rarest varnish man's cunning fingers can compound. Nothing of human nature is altered. The heart of this generation, however, is gross; its ear dull, and its eye shut. The sources of this complex and dominant disorder are not far to seek. The ingenuity of our now dying century has elaborately veneered certain human vices and corrupt passions; and robed in such novel and attractive garb thus presented them, haloed by the stormy trumpet-blasts of a vaunting and delusive evolution, to the world; and the world has, hopelessly, been attracted thereby and fatally ensnared. What makes the heart of any generation gross, dulls its ear, and shuts its eye? Sensuality, indifference and error—things of themselves and in their nature very repulsive always to the nobler instincts of man. The guiding, or misguiding, spirits of our restless cycle fully recognizing this instinctive repulsion, after considering the situation long and maturely, concluded to veil and hide those crudities; and so we have in our midst, sensuality, indifference and error draped as progress, enlightenment and science. *Ecce Signum!!*

Now, in the face of this posture of affairs what is the solemn duty of the preacher of Divine Truth? Must he drift indolently with the current and join the loudest, in this Bable-like chorus of jubilation and hosannah? It is hard, indeed, to make head against the 'stream of tendency'; always toilsome and unpleasant; and never compensative of the vigor expended. But it is infinitely sadder to be shattered and torn in the vortex of the whirlpool that boils with hungry fury, in its mad eagerness to swallow up the precious treasures of both our mundane existence, and of the higher existence beyond.

Some one, unconsciously influenced by the floating sophistry of the age, would, perhaps, be here prompted to suggest meekly that the pulpit has lost its pristine power; and so is now impotent to stem the onflowing tide of impious thought. The press, weeningly,

glorifies and magnifies itself over the assumed fact that it has entirely displaced and supplanted the pulpit. The press is, therefore, the engine that must be used in this intellectual battle—just as fire is best fought with fire. Here is a delusion as groundless as it is widespread. The press of itself, and in its legitimate rôle, is the prime handmaid of the pulpit. It echoes, and re-echoes, and multiplies the words of the commissioned preacher, and has its proper mission, as far as religion is concerned, in this specific function. Hence the incalculable utility of a well supported, able, judicious Catholic press. But as a teacher of principles and an expounder of truth it is a nullity. The sphere assigned it, by universal adjudgment, is a "disseminator of novelties true and false." It is an agency, not an agent; an echo, not a living voice. Dull, indeed, must he be who cannot discern in all this a diversity of function and variety of force.

It is no less true than it is pernicious to public sanity that oft-times erroneous tenets are promulgated, with a too easy facility, through the medium of the press. But the ill consequences are far lighter, except on one or two subjects, than is generally supposed. The relative values of the direct preceptor and the printed reflex form a most striking contrast. Vocalization is a power which naturally produces conviction and implants principles when neither preconception nor prejudice sways. Letter-press, at most, suggests doubts, or induces misty opinions and indefinite surmisings; unless some prior instruction has, peculiarly, prepared the mind for the reception of these views. In which case, indeed, the repetition of them through the press has its own particular pointedness and cogency which, in an age like ours, is not to be ignored.

The existence and presence of those hazy views, opinions and variegated conjectures—which now constitute the whole positive achievement of journalism, secular, heretical and infidel—no efficient preacher of the Word of God can, for a moment, overlook or forget. To pass them by, unnoted and undissipated, is to preach to gross hearts, dull ears and closed eyes. These doubts and the rest may not be apparent from the words and habits of the audience. But they all have, nevertheless, a mental recognition, latent or otherwise, in every swelling bosom that throbs responsive to the agitated social billows of the modern world. This diseased state of the Christian mind can be aptly described as the regrettable taint of subjective infidelity—that canker-worm of religion in the nineteenth century. Captious arguments, false theories, impious sayings,

seeming difficulties and frivolous objections, from one source and another, are ceaselessly swimming about in our social atmosphere. Coupled with the supreme self-assurance and pretence that ever accompany them, these have sufficient subtlety and plausibility, if not to destroy, at least to blunt the keen, sensitive edge of divine faith in the hearts of simple, unlearned Christians. With an audience or congregation so tainted—and even the most remote rural people have contracted the contagion up to a certain stage—the purely *expository method* of preaching, so lauded and prevalent in our day, is utterly valueless, or worse. It not uncommonly serves merely as an irritant to warm into life dormant scepticism; and so renders what was almost innoxious before, strong on the side of evil.

The question—half exclamation, half query—is frequently asked: Was there ever a generation on earth that had more preaching or derived therefrom less benefit? It must be answered: There was hardly ever another generation so favored and perverse. Then it is triumphantly and significantly added: preaching cannot be the grand panacea for current ills. This does not, however, follow. The preaching in general use, may not be of the right consistence and complexion—which is the fact.

Others bring forward as a final and knock-down argument that the world will no longer listen to a preacher with the patient, hearty attention of the past. There are so many periodicals and papers, books and pamphlets to instruct the ignorant, and further enlighten the instructed. This is, contrary to the intent of those who urge it, a two-edged argument. It rather proves that the existing system of preaching does not meet the evident wants of the times—being neither as instructive nor as enlightening as it should be. It is a clumsy slander on the living world to assert that it is indifferent to any knowledge which comes within its comprehension. That veteran pantheist, Carlyle, emphasizes this fact strikingly in his bizarre way: "the Sansculottic People, with its rude soul, listens eager—as men will to any sermon, or sermons, when it is a spoken word meaning a thing, and not a babblement meaning no-thing." The French Revol. Bk. III. This is a palpable truth of human nature, in all life's experience, which is worthy of note and serious consideration, let who will tell it. The sermon that means something to the hearers, is always listened to with manifest interest and rapt attention. Herein, too, is the magic key to the intricate situation.

But the advocates of the expository exhortative method will insist that their expositions of the Word do always mean something. There is not the slightest inclination to deny here that, abstractedly considered and apart from the circumstances and auditors, this method presents the Word of God: but it is insisted that it does not present it intelligibly to those dull ears with which it has to deal. We have a parallel defect in the favored philosophy of the day. These philosophical methods present the entire range of philosophic principles, it is true, but they present them so bent as to suit and harmonize with the curvatures of each method; and therefore, in a weakened, diluted, hardly recognizable manner. It should be ever principles first. If the principles be sound and pure they will of themselves amply determine the method. So in religious teachings, too, truth and its direct necessities must have the first place and the system always a secondary.

In the expository system of preaching the exposition of the Word is, indeed, formally first. But as it is based on an unfounded assumption it is in reality only second. Preachers, after this model, invariably assume that their auditors have had sufficient preliminary instruction by which they have been fitted for a larger explication of Divine Truth. That were a consummation devoutly to be wished. But in actual life it remains a wish merely. The major part of the congregation, probably, had a more or less perfect rudimentary catechetical instruction prior to their twelfth year. But those early impressions, faint at best, are surely dimmed by days: and it may be blurred, beyond recognition, by subsequent intercourse with the care-laden world. The expositions and exhortations of the preacher, in such instances, mean and can mean nothing to such auditors—no matter with what eloquence and force he may present them. This is, indeed, the arch-secret of the barrenness of so much of the preaching of our age. Religious locutions are not interpreted by the preacher in the popular idiom. The sound is familiar; but not the meaning. To them it is literally what Carlyle terms a 'babblement'—to which men will not listen with any patience.

A servile copying and irrational adhesion to ancient models is, more or less, responsible for the recognized inadequacy of this manner of preaching. As mines and treasure-houses of Truth the homilies of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church are, and always will be, worthy of the ardent and unremitting study of the effective preacher. But the forms and styles in which they are couched, were modes and fashions incidental to the periods wherein they were

framed and uttered. Modes change and fashions disappear with the generation that conceived and moulded them. They are, doubtless, venerable because of their source and years; but not, therefore, wisely fitted for utilization in another and far different era. While Truth changes not and is unchangeable, its vehicles are ever variable and its garnitures senescent. Civil surroundings and stages of intelligence will ever bias and attune the chosen system of the prudent public teacher. Otherwise his words, like the idle moanings of ocean on the rock-ribbed coast, will fall irresponsive and unheeded.

The state and condition of civilized society now justify, to the full, the loud clamor of those who are crying out, in despite of harsh rebuke and angry menace, for the dialective exhortative method of preaching. The difference between "*the expository exhortative*" and "*the dialective exhortative*" methods of preaching is very characteristic and consists chiefly in this sequent fact. The first assumes that the minds of the auditors are already well prepared for the reception of further and higher religious truths, which it forthwith expounds: while the other pre-supposes these same minds, to a certain degree, pre-occupied, or leastwise, in some sort fascinated by secular speculations; which it proceeds, in so far forth as the subject-matter of the discourse demands it, firstly to remove by exhibiting their falsity and fatuity. That done, it then inculcates the Gospel-truths gainsaid: which it is enabled the more easily and impressively to do, by reason of the telling contrast it has just held up to the mind's eye.

But the objector will here interpose: This would necessitate a thorough knowledge of these material speculations and sciences—which is to burden the preacher with studies uncongenial to his sacred calling and tastes. In so far as acquiring a familiarity with the secular theories of life—a labor which every educated man voluntarily undergoes—may be termed a study, it will be an additional burden. But it is a very light one. There is no profundity in it. A slight toil, hardly to be distinguished from recreation, will amply suffice for all practical purposes. Those multifarious theories are mostly sophistries: and sophistries are not unravelled and solved by studying them in themselves, but in the principles they combat and controvert. Who has ever earnestly engaged in the study of philosophy or theology, that has not met sophistical solutions of sophistries only a little less pernicious than the original falsehoods? It all comes from studying difficulties with a captious, and not a

truth-loving spirit. It displays a great want of loyal confidence in the innate power of truth to overwhelm all adversaries. Final and all-satisfying solutions of objections and difficulties against truth of any order can be furnished by no fictitious substitute. A thorough and profound study of the special truth denied, while holding the objection full in view, will, assuredly in every case, provide the painstaking student with the right cue to the puzzle. This cannot be an uncongenial study: for it is the study of theology: and a study of theology, too, which broadens the mind by severely exercising its keeness and penetration.

What then, with these scientific mouthings, it will be said, becomes of the sacred precept: *Praedica Verbum.* Oh! by all means preach the Word of God. But remember that this does not mean stringing together pious phrases in a manner that is quite unintelligible to the listeners. It means: so announce the truths of divine revelation that the hearers may understand, learn and practice them. What is the use, not to employ a harsher term, of proclaiming the efficacy of Grace to a people who entertain, in whole or in part, the monstrous theory, now so common, that heredity alone shapes the morals of men; or reliance on Providence to those who cling to the illusive fantasy of evolution. These and the like thousand other absurd preconceptions and half-beliefs so prevalent, must, it is evident, be eradicated and banished from the popular mind before their victims can or will understand, learn and practice the salutary lessons of divine truth. The most brilliant exposition, the most touching exhortation, will, otherwise, fall without result on dull, or mayhap, disgusted ears.

Truth, though ever old, is ever new—old in itself, new in man's first and fresh perception thereof. There is no need to exhaust one's small stock of energy in reprobating that mental curiosity of the race which leads it, steadily, to pry into the innumerable mysteries that hem it round. One of the purposes, indeed, of Almighty Wisdom, in thus walling us in with mysteries, is to elicit rational effort, and so elevate us, despite our sensual grossness. Intellectual activity then, so far from being a thing reprehensible, is the chiefest mundane glory of Christianity. Ponder a brief moment, what a potent weapon the unreflecting narrowness of some Christian preachers has placed in the hands of the scorner and infidel. Infidels claim, with insufferable pomp and bombast, that the material progress of our age owes nothing to Christianity; that, in fact, it is the direct outcome of a fierce rebellion against its cherished doc-

trines of mortification and contempt of the munera terrae. To answer this cavil by citing, as is usually done, a long list of Christian scientists and inventors is both fond and vain. The list is waved aside with the contemptuous words—men are not always consistent. And, verily, it is not the proper solvent for the malign arrogance of infidelity.

Christianity and Christian ideals stimulate and nurture, as they have ever done, the mental powers : and mental powers matured find, and go on finding out additional of the secrets and forces imbedded in nature. Thus adduced we have Christianity as the efficient, kind, and even careful nursing-mother of grateful, or ingrate, inventors and scientists. Why do the savage and the heathen, who love material comforts and earthly delights incomparably more than even the apostate Christian, penetrate the thick wrappages of the physical Universe, and wrench thence those sensual gratifications for which they incessantly pine and long? For no other reason, as even the dullest may perceive, than that they have no Christian guide to point the way—no Christian truths and ideals as well-springs of high and even higher advance and endeavors. The argument from the abuse of science is idle if not slanderous in the mouth of the Christian preacher. If degenerated Christians prevent Christian knowledge and its conquests, and turn from the Creator to the creature ; this is not caused by the knowledge. It is attributable solely to the sad prerogative of our fallen state—which still, though in its perversity, shows that the good ordained of God, even in ruins, is ever glorious : as is the starlight on the faded brow of Lucifer.

S. M.

## CONFERENCES.

### DISCREPANCIES IN THE "ORDOS."

*Qu.* There is a discrepancy in the different *Ordos* for this year regarding the Feasts of *Corpus Christi* and *SS. Peter and Paul*, the solemn celebration of which is to be transferred to the Sunday following when said feasts occur on a weekday. In the Masses, assigned for the transferred solemnity, two *Ordos* which I have seen require the Gospel of the Sunday to be said at the end. Another *Ordo* says nothing and hence allows you to infer that the last Gospel is the "In Principio" of St. John. The latter seems to be the more correct according to De Herdt (Praxis, Vol. II, n 295 seq.), who states that this Mass is celebrated *more votivae solemnis* with *Gloria, Credo* and the *Gospel of St. John* at the end as is the rule in *votive* Masses.

Which is the right rubric in this case?

*Resp.* Neither of the different *Ordos* can be said to be wrong; they are rather incomplete for practical guidance. The two indults granted to the dioceses of the United States whereby the feasts of SS. Peter and Paul and of *Corpus Christi* are transferred to the Sunday following do not mention anything regarding the particular rubrics to be observed in the celebration of the Mass. It may therefore be presumed that the rite is regulated by the rules given anent the indult *pro reductione festorum* (9 Ap. 1802) for France, and since then applied in other regions. According to these rules "sola solemnitas praefatorum festorum differetur in dominicam subsequentem, in qua officium quidem a clero tam publice quam privatim, et missa recitabitur juxta consuetam ordinem; centetur tamen *una missa solemnis* de festo illo *more votivo* cum unica oratione: minime omissa in cathedralibus aliisve ecclesiis, in quibus officium publice agatur, et adsit sufficiens numerus ecclesiasticorum, altera missa conventuali de festo occurrente."

Hence the principal Mass on Sunday, which is the so-called High Mass, is celebrated as a solemn *votive* Mass of the transferred feast. In this Mass no commemoration is made of the Sunday or feast occurring (nor is the collect pro Papa or other added), and the last Gospel is that of St. John, *In principio*, because at least one other Mass, either of the Sunday or of the regular occurring feast (with commemoration of the Sunday), is supposed to be celebrated. In this Mass the Gospel of the Sunday is read, according to the pre-

scribed rubrics of the Mass, either at the beginning or at the end. It is not necessary that this be a *missa cantata* as is required for collegiate churches and others where the office is publicly recited. But if there be only one Mass in the church, then the commemoration of the Sunday and of occurring feasts are made in this Mass, which is that of the transferred solemnity; and the Gospel of the Sunday occurring is said at the end instead of the *In principio.* (Cf. De Herdt, vol. II, n. 300.)

If the said feasts occur on a Sunday they are as a rule to be celebrated on that day, and then both the commemoration and the Gospel of the Sunday *in fine* have a place in the Mass of the day.

The privilege of transferring the solemn celebration of the feast of SS. Peter and Paul to the Sunday following was granted to the United States in 1840 (Conc. Prov. Balt. iv).

We append the Decree permitting the transfer, in the U. St., of *Corpus Christi* together with the reduction of certain feasts formerly *de praecepto* in this country.

---

**DECRETUM.**

*De diebus festis in Statibus Foederatis Americae.*

"Romae, d. 31. Dec. 1885. *Illme. ac Rme. Domine.* Ab. Amplitudine Tua nomine Patrum Concilii Tertii Plenarii Baltimorensis sequens supplicatio Summo Pontifici exhibita fuit, ut dies festi de praecepto ad quosdam determinatos, in omnibus Diocesibus Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis servandos, reducerentur.

*Beatissime Pater.*—Intra fines Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis magna obtinet diversitas in observandis diebus festis de praecepto. In aliis enim locis quinque, in aliis vere novem, in aliis etiam plures servantur, adeo ut non tantum acatholici, sed et fideles hac de re iam commoveantur, non parum mirantes qua ratione id fiat, ut certis diebus obligatio audiendi missam et abstinendi ab operibus servilibus urgeat in una dioecesi vel provincia, in altera vero non. Praeterea in hisce regionibus et fideles gravissimis premuntur difficultatibus quoad observantiam dierum festorum. Quum enim in parandis vitae necessariis magna ex parte ab acatholicis pendeant, qui labores diebus festis, nisi in Dominicas incidant, intermitti non patiuntur, maxima fidelium pars nonnisi cum gravissimis incommodis iisdem diebus ab operibus abstinere et SS. Missae Sacrificio interesse possunt. Hinc Patres in Concilio plenario Balti-

morensi Tertio congregati, summopere in votis habentes ut uniformitas in servandis Festis inducatur, matureque perpendentes difficultates, quibus fideles intra Foederatas has Provincias laborant, Beatitudini Tuae supplicandum duxerunt:

1st. Ut, attentis peculiaribus circumstantiis Catholicorum in hisce regionibus morantium, Apostolica Auctoritate dignetur declarare, per omnes dioeceses Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, de praecepto audiendi Missam et abstinendi a servilibus, servandos esse dies festos omnes et solos qui sequuntur: Immaculata Conceptio B. M. V., Nativitas D. N. J. C., Circumcisio D. N. J. C., Ascensio D. N. J. C., Assumptio B. M. V., Festum Omnium Sanctorum. Per rerum enim temporumque rationes istorum sex dierum festorum observatio felicius speratur.

2d.—Quoad ceteros dies festos, qui praeter sex supradictos quibusdam in locis adhuc de praecepto sunt, ut ex Apostolica benignitate eorumdem locorum fideles solvantur quidem ab obligatione Missam audiendi et ab operibus abstinendi: quin tamen iidem dies festi quoad devotionem et solemnitatem externam supprimantur.

3d.—Ad festum SS. Corporis Christi quod spectat, ut benigne indulgere velit quod eiusdem Festi solemnitas in diem Dominicam proxime sequentem transferatur, ad normam indulti dioecesibus Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis concessi quoad festum SS. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ut habetur in litteris S. Congr. de Prop. Fide ad Archiepiscopum Baltimorensem diei 19 decembris 1840.

S. I. C. d. 25, Nov. 1885, respondit: Supplicandum SSmo. pro gratia iuxta preces . . . Sanctitas vero sua . . . Patrum Conc. Plenar. Baltimor. tertii precibus iuxta S. C. sententiam benigne annuere dignata est."

---

## THE HYMN IN THE OFFICE OF ST. JOHN BAPT.

Some time ago my attention was called to an obscure passage in the hymn recited at Lauds in the office of St. John the Baptist. The author of the hymn is Paul the Deacon who lived in the eighth century at Monte Casino. In offering a translation of the difficult stanza I follow the text of the Cistercian Breviary which, though slightly different from that of the Roman, leaves the sense unchanged.

"Serta ter denis alios coronant
Aucta crementis, duplicata quosdam;
Trina centeno cumulata fructu
Te sacer ornant."

*Translation:*

"Wreaths enriched with thirty-fold ornaments crown some; sixty-fold (*Duplicata*—double the others' value) wreaths crown certain others; three-fold wreaths laden with fruit one hundred-fold beautify thee, O holy man."

The stanza evidently alludes to verses 8 and 23 of the xiii chapter of St. Matthew. The transposition of "alios" and "quosdam" seems to be made simply to suit the measure, and the triple wreath on the brow of the Baptist clearly refers to his three-fold character of *Virgin*, *Prophet* and *Martyr*.

D. A. DONAVAN

Without criticizing our Reverend Correspondent's version we would add that, just as *serta* in its etymology does not suggest so much a "crown" as it does a garland, whose interwoven strands might still bear the flower or the berry of the myrtle, the word "fruits" would be preferable, in a literal translation to "ornaments."

Moreover since *serta* is rarely used in the singular it may be best considered as a plural substantive; and the distributive *trina* (which form, instead of *terna*, would be most commonly used in such a connection) might be translated as a cardinal number—"three" instead of "three-fold." The Baptist's crown would then be the *tiara* of a "Virgin, Prophet and Martyr."

The difficulty of retaining in a literal version the suggestion of the word *crementum* (growth) which brings vividly before the mind the parable in Matthew xiii, is obvious

As our correspondent suggests, the variation between the two versions of the Cistercian and Roman Brevaries is slight, appearing only in the third and fourth lines. We place both side by side submitting a translation of the Roman text.

| *Roman Breviary.* | *Cistercian Breviary.* |
|---|---|
| Serta ter denis alios coronant | Serta ter denis alios coronant |
| Aucta crementis, duplicata quosdam | Aucta crementis, Duplicata quosdam |
| Trina te fructu cumulata centum | Trina centeno cumulata fructu |
| Nexibus ornant. | Te Sacer ornant. |

"Wreaths bearing thirty-fold fruit crown some; such wreaths doubled crown others; a three-fold wreath, burdened with fruit, adorns thee with an hundred interlacing strands."

H. T. H.

## THE MASS FOR THE PURGATORIAL SOCIETY.

*Qu.* There exists a society in New York to aid the holy souls of Purgatory by offering prayers and works of charity with this intention. A large number of priests are affiliated as honorary members who accept the responsibility of saying Mass once a month for the deceased members of the Association. The question has recently been mooted here whether it would be lawful to say this Mass with the general intention of satisfying the obligation of the Purgatorial Society and at the same time to accept a stipend for a special intention independent of the former object.

You would oblige many readers by answering the above query.

*Resp.* The obligation to apply the Mass for the particular intention specified by the compact must be interpreted by the terms of the clause on which it is based. It is a question of mutual benefit; on the one side there are the advantages of honorary membership which entitle to participation in certain prayers, numerous and definite works of charity and special indulgences granted to the society. On the other hand, the definite obligation of offering the holy sacrifice of the Mass, once a month, for the deceased members is imposed by the society and accepted by the priest. Whether this obligation of offering a monthly Mass excludes the application of any other special intention (fructus specialis), such as the acceptance of a stipend implies, depends on the expressed purpose of the society which proposed the compact.

Where this purpose is not fully expressed it may be gathered from the circumstances. Thus, if the rules of the society imposed a monthly tax of one or more dollars upon honorary members generally for the promotion of its charitable works, and exempted priests from this duty under condition that they would say a Mass every month, the meaning would plainly be that the contribution expected of members ordinarily was to be applied in the case of the clergy to offerings for the Holy Sacrifice, since, although no "stipend" is actually paid them, they receive its equivalent in the benefits which accrue to them from their membership.

Our Reverend Confrère does not state in his query what are the understood obligations of members in the above mentioned society. We would therefore be inclined to answer, that, apart from the spirit of generosity which in most cases should prompt a priest to add the sacrifice of a stipend wherever he has reason to doubt the extent of his obligation, and where utter poverty does not force him to accept a daily stipend, the obligation assumed in the case would have to be interpreted in the ordinary sense in which "special in-

tentions" are accepted, since the acceptance is not gratuitous. However the locality whence the question comes to us leads us to suppose that there is question here not of any Purgatorial society but of the one called *Society of the Helpers of the Holy Souls of Purgatory* established first in Paris in 1857 and of late years transplanted to England and America.

In the statutes of this society we read: "Honorary Members engage to give an *annual* subscription of not less than one dollar" etc. Further on reference is made to priests and religious who become Honorary members of the society, "the former by undertaking to say Mass, and the latter by offering Holy Communion once a month, for all the deceased members."

This throws considerable light on the conditions of the compact entered into between the association and its honorary members. It cannot be supposed that the purpose was to bind priests to a greater extent than religious or secular members under similar circumstances. The religious offer their Holy Communion once a month, whilst the lay members are required to contribute a small sum, less than ten cents, each month. The priest may therefore be supposed to satisfy his obligation by offering a monthly Mass in the same way in which a religious offers his or her Holy Communion, without the additional sacrifice of surrendering a stipend which would at the end of the year largely exceed the sum required from the lay-contributors.

This seems to us the equitable point of view, but we believe that there are few priests who would ask themselves the question of whether they must forfeit a comparatively small amount of lawful income, when it goes to benefit the suffering souls whose intensity of love for God grows in proportion to the generous charity which intercedes for their union with the spotless Being which gave them their life destined to be consummated eternally in perfect love.

---

## CHURCHING A NON-CATHOLIC.

*Qu.* Last year a lady called on me and requested that I would impart to her the blessing given by the Church to Catholic women after recovery from "confinement." She was a Protestant, married to a Catholic gentleman whom I knew, and though to all appearance, favorably disposed towards the Church had never expressed a desire to become a Catholic herself. I did not precisely know what to answer her, for she was very earnest and at the moment I saw no reason why I should refuse her a blessing

which required no explicit profession of the Catholic faith and could only benefit her. In order to think the matter over without letting her know of my hesitancy, I took some pretext for leaving the parlor, saying that I should return in a minute. On going out my assistant met me and beckoned to speak to me. He had been asked the day previously by the husband whether his wife might not be "churched," as she had heard the explanation of the ceremony from a Catholic lady and had been continually asking him to inquire whether she could not receive the blessing. The curate had told him quite decidedly that he did not think it could be done, as the lady was not a Catholic. His plea was "communicatio in sacris."

I returned to the parlor and made the lady repeat her request. Then I said in a decided manner: Madam, the blessings which the Catholic Church dispenses will be yours as soon as you can make up your mind to become a Catholic. She went away evidently regretful but not displeased.

Now the reason of my refusal to give her the blessing *mulieris post partum* as found in the Ritual was not the conviction that it would have been wrong to do so, but the fact that my curate had expressed his view to the husband and I did not wish to let it appear as if there could be any variance of opinion between us, which might create doubts about orthodoxy in the minds of those who do not distinguish between the unity of Catholic doctrine and the ordinary discipline in non-essentials of faith, which admits of adaptation to circumstances.

Would I have been right in giving the blessing, and if not, why?

The lady is now a Catholic.

*Resp.* The action of our Reverend inquirer can only be commended for its prudence. By it the false impression, so easily made on Protestants and lukewarm Catholics, that a diversity of practice in certain details of ecclesiastical discipline implies dissension as to the rule of our faith, was avoided and, not to speak of the edification given to a brother priest by the manner in which his opinion was seconded, although not shared by a superior when dealing with an outsider, the lady herself was, no doubt, urged to her conversion by the conciousness that so long as she was out of the Catholic Church she would be debarred from many graces which she appreciated and anxiously desired.

As to the propriety of giving the blessing of the Church in a case like this, much must depend on the circumstances.

As a rule we should be inclined to give this blessing to any mother who evinces a sincere desire for it, so long as there is no danger of scandalizing the weak among the faithful who might look upon the action as an elimination of the distinction between Catholicity and sectarianism. On the other hand, a priest may have good reason for refusing it when he is convinced that greater good would result from his doing so, inasmuch as it would be

likely to urge a person, trustful of the blessings of the Catholic Church toward embracing the religion which is their chief source.

Apart, then, from considerations of the prudence, we see no valid reason why the *Benedietio mulieris post partum* may not be imparted under the above mentioned circumstances, which are most apt to occur in cases of mixed marriage. There is no question here of a "communicatio in sacris" in its objectionable features, as when a Catholic takes part in erroneous worship. It is a case of non-Catholics seeking to participate in some measure in the benefits of true worship. Nor can it be said that we are taking "the bread of the children and cast it to the dogs;" on the contrary, the argument of the Gentile woman, approved by our Lord, holds good here, we are giving of the "crumbs of the children." (S. Marc. vii, 27.)

It must not be forgotten that this blessing is of an intercessory character; it does not require a predisposition such as is essential for the worthy and valid reception of the sacraments. It does not call for a profession of the articles of Catholic faith, unless in so far as they are recognized in the very act of asking the blessing. If a priest may use the holy name of Jesus in praying a benediction over anyone who needs or desires it, though he be not in the state of grace nor even baptized, then he may, for a like reason, use this form of blessing which contains prayer of thanksgiving and petition such as may be put into the mouth of any creature who seeks God more or less consciously. Indeed the form given in the Ritual points to what we have said. The Antiphon with which this rite begins, taken from the xxiii Psalm, reads: *Let her receive a blessing from the Lord and mercy from the God of her salvation, because such is the generation of those who seek the Lord.* Then the entire Psalm is recited and an act of adoration to which a Christian woman would naturally consent if she believes in the efficacy of this christian blessing is asked of her in the words: "Enter into the temple of God, adore the Son of the blessed Virgin Mary who has given to thee the fruit of an offspring." The remaining prayers are for help and protection. "O omnipotent eternal God who hast, through the Son of the blessed Virgin Mary, turned the sorrow of Christian mothers into joy, look kindly upon this Thy servant who comes joyfully to Thy holy temple in order to give thanks to Thee; and grant that at the end of her earthly life, she may, together with her child, obtain the joys of eternal happiness, through the merits and intercession of that same blessed Virgin."

"May the peace and blessing of the Almighty the Father and Son and Holy Ghost descend on thee and remain forever with thee."

Amen.

To many a doubtful mother's heart the explanation of this blessing together with the imparting of it would probably open the way to the true light of faith and the salvation of generations to come.

---

## A CASE OF RESTITUTION.

An old miser dies intestate. Several of his relations who had been living near him were present at his death.

Shortly after, a poor laborer and his family move on to the deceased man's farm and occupy the old house where the latter died. One day the new tenant finds on the premises a purse containing something over a hundred dollars. He is morally sure that the money belonged to the former occupant who is now dead, hence he says nothing of his find to anyone, quieting his conscience by reasoning thus: "His friends and relations were here when he died. He told them nothing of the money and left no will which proves that he did not wish them to have it."—He therefore uses the sum to pay his own debts.

After a time he comes to confession. Is he bound to restitution? If so, to whom? If to the relatives, to which ones? In what manner shall he do so, for if he publishes the affair he is likely to be suspected of having kept the money for his own use up to the present time etc.

*Solution.*

The finder of the money has no title to its use or possession since he justly surmises the rightful owner who, though dead, survives in his heirs *de jure*. These, since the original possessor of the money left no will, claim the estate *exdispositione juris*. The purse cannot, therefore, be regarded as *res derelicta quae fit primi occupantis*, but, so long as it was witheld from the rightful heirs, it was, what theologians call *res aliena detenta* which constitutes an obligation of restitution.

But to whom is the money to be restored? To the nearest lawful heir or heirs, determined in doubtful cases by process of law. It may be a question of *bona vacantia, i. e.*, where there are no *direct* heirs, in which case the local civil tribunal determines the apportionment of the property to be made. "Bona vacantia," says Kenrick (Theol. Moral. Vol. i, Cap. v, 3), "dicuntur, quae quis intestatus reliquit cui nullus haeres juxta legem ab intestato succedat

. . . . Leges Americanae inter propinquos ea distribuunt, administratoris opera, sed curiam civilem arbitrem constituunt."

If, as may be supposed in the case, there was other property disposed of by the appointment of an administrator under the American law, the money might be sent to the latter for equitable distribution between the legal heirs, and this could be done without indicating the source whence the money has come, simply requiring a public voucher for its having been received. Where direct restitution cannot be made without positively incriminating the finder, the latter would be justified in disposing of the money in charities with the intention of benefiting the deceased, who, in not appointing his heirs of his property from among his kindred, when it is supposed he could have done so, showed that he was not, at least, absolutely opposed to any other equitable disposition of his money.

The question of restitution of added interest hardly enters into the case, since the *damnum emergens*, or the *lucrum cessans*, arising from a withholding of the comparatively small sum, and under a doubtful disposition of mind as to the definite ownership, does not beget a distinct obligation.

D. J. D.

---

## MISSA VOTIVA SOLEMNIS LECTA.

On two previous occasions we gave it as our opinion that the votive Mass of the Sacred Heart granted by Indult of 28, June, 1889, wherever special devotions are held in honor of the Sacred Heart on the first Friday of the month, might be a low Mass. We have now a decree of the S. Congregation, solicited by the Vicar General of Rheims, to the same effect, so that there need be no scruple in having the devotions even in the absence of solemn music.

*Dubium.*

Ex-Apostolico Indulto diei 28 Juni, 1889, in Archidioeceseos Rhemen. Ecclesiis, ubi feria sexta, quae prima occurrit in unoquoque mense, fiunt de mane pia exercitia in honorem Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu, Missa votiva de eodem Sacro Corde solet celebrari Quum vero Sacra Rituum Congregatio die 20 Maii, 1890, rescripserit ejusmodi Missam celebrandam esse ritu, quo Missae votivae solemniter cum *Gloria* et *Credo* atque unica oratione celebrantur; hinc Rmus Vicarius Generalis Emi et Rmi Dni Cardinalis Benedicti Mariae Langinénieux Archiepiscopi Rhemensis eidem Congregationi sequens Dubium pro opportuna declaratione humillime subjecit, nimirum :

An haec verba *Missa votiva Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu, ritu Missae votivae solemnis celebranda* intelligi queant etiam de missa lecta, seu sine cantu?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, exquisitoque voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Ministris, re mature perpensa, proposito Dubio rescribendum censuit: *Affirmative.* Atque ita rescripsit et declaravit die 20 Maii, 1892.

†CAJ. *Card.*, ALOISI-MASELLA, *Praef.*,
VINCENTIUS NUSSI, *Secretarius.*

---

## THE HON. ZACH. MONTGOMERY ON OUR PROPOSED SCHOOL BILL.

We are glad to place before our readers some strictures by the Hon. Zach. Montgomery upon the *Ideal School Bill*, drafted by the Hon. Martin Morris, of Washington, and published in our July number. They are worthy of consideration, first, because any reasonable discussion is likely to throw all-sided light upon the proposed measure, and thereby to bring it to perfection; secondly, because they come from one of the most worthy and self-sacrificing pioneers in the cause of Catholic education and in the defence of parental rights upon the basis sanctioned by our American Constitution. EDITOR.

SAN DIEGO, CAL., July 9, 1892.

*Editor American Ecclesiastical Review:*

SIR:—Will you permit one of your lay subscribers and the father of a family, who has devoted considerable time to the study of the "school question," to submit through your REVIEW a few suggestions touching "A Bill for the promotion of education in the State," prepared by Hon. M. F. Morris, LL.D., and published in the July number of your excellent periodical.

While heartily in sympathy with the principle of parental rights and educational liberty, which said bill aims to secure, the undersigned either fails to understand the precise plan contemplated by the bill in question, or else he finds therein provisions which he fears are neither consistent with each other, nor conducive to the laudable end sought to be accomplished. In the following quotations from the bill, the seemingly contradictory provisions referred to, are italicized.

The first section of this bill begins by providing, "That whenever any individual or body or association of individuals, or any organization of persons, incorporated or unincorporated, shall have established a school for the free education of youth *in the primary branches of education, to wit: in reading, writing and arithmetic*, and such school shall have been in existence for the term of at least one year with no less than —— pupils in regular attendance, and shall have submitted to a satisfactory inspection and examination thereof by the State or local Board of School Trustees, etc., the person or persons, association or organization, conducting and managing such school, shall be entitled to receive . . . each year such remuneration as may be sufficient to defray the cost of the management of such school, including therein the rent (or rental value) of the building in which the same is located, . . . *Provided always*, that the cost hereby provided to be paid, shall not be ratably greater than the cost of maintaining and conducting the public schools of the State, and that such ratable cost shall be determined by the Board of School Trustees," etc. And after thus limiting in the first section the education provided for, to "the primary branches," to wit: *reading, writing and arithmetic*, the fourth section *provides*, "That the provisions of this Act shall apply only to *primary and grammar schools, or schools in which the course of study is substantially equal to that in use in the Public Schools of the State.*"

There seems to be here a contradiction between the first and fourth sections of the bill. The former limiting the education provided for, to "reading, writing and arithmetic," and the latter extending it to the whole Public School course, whatever it may be.

If interpreted simply by the light of its own language, the fourth section of the bill, being subsequent to the first, might perhaps be fairly construed as abrogating it, so far as the same conflicts therewith. But, unfortunately for such a construction of this bill, its author has prefaced it with certain explanatory remarks, indicating that *he*, at least, *could* not have so understood the language he employed. In the course of his preface to the bill he expresses his emphatic condemnation of the growing practice under the Public School system of teaching the higher branches at public expense. Referring to the Public School system he says:

"We may remark, however, that its worst enemies are those inconsiderate admirers of it, who would enlarge its scope so as to make it embrace the languages, music, and the ornamental branches of education, and who would extend it so far as to finally comprise

the college and university as part of the system. For when this is done it ceases to be the Common School system of the people. It becomes what it is now rapidly becoming, the means by which the designing few and the unprincipled rich procure the education of their children at the cost of the many, and to the exclusion of the poor." * * *

Now, it would not be reasonable, nor would it be fair, to charge the author of said bill with an intention to join hands with "the designing few and unprincipled rich," by incorporating into the proposed educational plan what he himself denounces as the very worst features of the present Public School system. And yet if the fourth section of said bill is to be so construed as to give it its apparently obvious meaning, it will be difficult to see what advantage the proposed system will have over the present Public School system, so far as regards the matter of teaching, at public expense, "the languages, music and the ornamental branches," etc.

Perhaps the author of the bill would inform the readers of the REVIEW whether or not it is possible (and if so, how it is possible), to harmonize the above seemingly conflicting provisions, as found in said sections 1 and 4 of this bill? Or, if said provisions cannot be harmonized, then in the event that the bill should become a law in its present shape, which of said two conflicting sections would control?

After learning more as to the actual meaning of this bill as interpreted by its author and its advocates, your correspondent may perhaps have more to say on the subject, provided you will allow a volunteer layman the use of your space for that purpose.

ZACH. MONTGOMERY.

## BOOK REVIEW.

**LE CAPITAL, LA SPECULATION, ET LA FINANCE AU XIXe SIECLE, par Claudio Janet, Professeur d'-Economie Politique a l'institut Catholique de Paris. Paris Plon, Nourrit et Cie, Rue Garanciere, n. 10.**

It is not often that we have the good fortune of reading the works of an economist who is as much at home with Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas, as with Stanley Jevous Walras and Leroy Beaulieu. This blending of the wisdom of antiquity with accurate modern observations ought to be as common as it is indispensable to a modern Christian scientist. The deep and far-reaching axioms of the stagirite and the superb analysis of his great commentator receive an unexpected and wonderful confirmation from the facts carefully grouped and scientifically explained by the modern masters. Mr. Claudio Janet is just the sort of economist that we need at the present time. Like Mr. Devas, he is thoroughly orthodox, both as a Christian philosopher, and as an economist. With a firm grasp of moral principles, a thorough understanding of the complex workings of economic laws, and a comprehensive knowledge of the historical evolution of wealth, he can fully appreciates the conditions under which modern society must meet the growing demands of civilization by increasing both the amount and the productiveness of capital.

The publication is most timely, for it contains a practical application of the encyclical 'Rerum Novarum.' The Catholic priests can no more consider the play of economic laws as a matter foreign to their sacred calling, for on these laws depends the sustenance of the body, and the body is essential to the soul: "In all well constituted states, it is by no means unimportant matter to provide those bodily and external commodities, the use of which is necessary to virtuous action . . . . . It follows that whatever shall appear to be conducive to the well-being of those who work should receive favorable consideration." (Encycl. Rerum Novarum.) Moreover, it is necessary for those who direct consciences, to know what transactions are legitimate, and what speculations involve a violation of the divine precepts.

A complete analysis of a work of more than six hundred pages, which follows capital through all its transformations, would require more space than can be given to a book notice. Besides, the book is so full of valuable and varied information that it can hardly bear condensing. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to a few points which seem to bear more directly on moral theology, viz.: the theory of interest, the difference between legitimate speculation and stock-jobbing or agiotage, and the anti-semitic

movement which was often checked by the sovereign Pontiffs, but which, of late, seems to have acquired a new energy.

With regard to the lawfulness of loaning money at interest has the Church modified her teaching? Some writers have imagined that she has reversed her previous decisions, and that her doctrine had varied on a point of moral and that consequently she was not infallible. A more serious consideration of the subject shows that the modification is more apparent than real; the principles are the same, but the circumstances are different. In the middle ages a comparatively small part of the wealth of nations was turned into capital and devoted to production. Wealth was to a great extent barren. Gold and silver could not be transformed at will into productive agencies, they were merely commodities or circulating mediums. (Author, p. 74.) At present, a workman may put one dime at interest by placing it in the hands of those who group small deposits, however insignificant they may be, and use the resulting sums to pay wages, to buy instruments of labor, or to carry on some profitable business. This is *indirect* productiveness, if you will, but it is productiveness. The sums resulting from those small savings are circulating capital, and without the quickening influence of circulating capital the industrial field would remain barren. Now capital, whether fixed or circulating, is one of the factors of production, and it is just that the man who supplies that factor should have a share in the produce.

Let us suppose three men who own severally a certain amount of money. The first buries his talent in the ground, the second spends it to buy luxuries, the third uses it to pay for productive labor or for instruments of labor. The miser contributes nothing to the public wealth; he does worse—he withdraws a value from circulation; he is certainly not entitled to a reward. The consumer, at least, helps to create a market, and by consuming wealth stimulates production; but he is amply repaid by enjoyment of the luxuries which he has bought. The capitalist, for the third man is a capitalist, becomes a partner in the creation of new wealth; he supplies one of the factors of production; he becomes a partial cause of that production; he is therefore entitled to a share in the produce.

It is evident, therefore, that where money is used as capital it becomes indirectly productive, and he who supplies the money may claim a part of the new value which that money has helped to create. This truth the schoolmen never denied. St Thomas, for instance, in a passage quoted by Mr. Claudio Janet, says explicitly: "It is lawful to derive profit from the money intrusted to a merchant or to a workman" ($2^a$ $2^{ae}$, q 78, art. $2^{ad}$, 5, and also, *a primum*). Why is it lawful in this case, whilst it is unlawful when money is lent without any reference to production? Not precisely (as Boehm-Bawerk asserts), because a future good has less value than a present one, and the depreciation incident on futurity must be made good, but because the money thus employed is true capital, and the lender becomes a partial cause of production.

All the theologians admitted that the following reasons justified the lender in claiming a compensation: Firstly, the stopping of a profit which he would have made had he retained the money (Lucrum cessans). Secondly, a loss incurred on account of the loan (Damnum emergens). Thirdly, the

danger of losing the money lent through the dishonesty or the misfortune of the borrower (Periculum sortis). Fourthly, a profit, agreed upon beforehand, in case of delayed payment (Pœna conventionalis). But there was a considerable amount of controversy with regard to a fifth plea, the *titulus legalis*, that is, a legal rate determined by the civil power. Those who objected to this title said that it involved a transfer of property in virtue of the right of Eminent Domain; but the right of Eminent Domain did not apply to the private transactions of citizens. The transfer was therefore invalid.

This objection is evidently ill-founded. In the first place, in a society where money can be turned into capital at a moment's notice, the *lucrum cessans* can always be invoked. Moreover, the State is perfectly within its own province when it says: "As a preserver of all the rights, and as in duty bound to enforce contracts, I declare that money can at any time be turned into capital, and that when it fulfills its functions as capital it commonly yields to the borrower such a yearly amount that 5 per cent. is a fair compensation for the lender. Therefore, I shall consider as usury the exacting of a higher rate, unless it be justified by special reasons and legalized by a special contract." In equivalently rendering this decision the legislative power merely defines a rule or norm to guide those who exercise the judicial authority; the State does not transfer property, but decides what is and what is not a legitimate transaction. Mr. Janet justly observes that credit on consumption is a very different thing from credit on production (p. 78–79). The former was predominant in the middle ages, the latter is now all but universal; the law is based, not on exceptions, but on what commonly happens, *de hoc quod plerumque fit*. Even in the sixteenth century the poor man's banks (mounts-of-piety or lumber houses) were allowed to collect a small interest on the sums loaned out. The principles have not been changed, but the circumstances have been altered; what was the exception before is now the rule. Any poor man, by intrusting his money to a savings bank, can make a little profit; if he forbears doing so to accommodate another man, there is for the lender a *lucrum cessans* for which he can claim a just compensation.

Yet the old contention that money is unproductive can be defended in the sense intended by its advocates; they abstracted from indirect productivity. When a property increased in value they put the question: whence comes the increment? From the inherent properties of the thing itself, which grows like a tree and bears its fruit, or from the labor and ingenuity of man? When the increment was due to the forces or to the activities of the object itself, it was called *productive*, when the increment was entirely due to the skill of man, the object was declared unproductive. Now it is evident that money is not productive in the former sense; it does not grow and multiply; its increase is always due to the skill of man who turns it to the best advantage by using it to pay for labor; or in some other way to support and stimulate production. As an instrument in the hand of man, it is unquestionably productive; but this is *indirect* not *direct* productivity.

To loan money at interest is already to speculate. "Speculation," says the author, "consists in forseeing the chances of profit that we may avail ourselves of our opportunities, and the dangers of loss that we may save ourselves from losing. It belongs to the very essence of trade, for the market price of commodities varying according to time and place, the merchant in buying his supplies is always liable to see the goods which he stores up, lose a part of their exchange value. Let us add that the wants of the manufacturer compel him to secure in advance supplies of raw material, to be delivered at the proper time and place. In like manner the large and sometimes sudden demands of the markets of the world cannot be met without contracts which often antedate production. Consequently there must be room for *futures* in financial transactions.

But speculation is not an evil in itself; the gains which it makes are often perfectly legitimate, they may be the rewards of keen foresight, great power of calculation, and perfect self-control. As long as speculation is not reckless, tainted with fraud, or based on fictitious values it is both permissible and useful to the public. The difficulty consists in distinguishing lawful speculation from fraudulent stock-jobbing or agiotage.

"If common gamblers," says Mr. Janet, "are uninteresting social parasites, the great stock speculators often become the disturbers of social equilibrium by so manipulating values as to determine rises and falls which the real condition of things does not justify, or by forcing the flow of wealth out of its natural channel. Such practices constitute agiotage." (P. 370.) From the passages already quoted, and from the illustrations scattered throughout the work the following definitions may perhaps be drawn and presented in a condensed form: *Legitimate speculation consists in forecasting and preparing for the rise and fall of prices.—Agiotage consists in raising or decreasing prices by fraudulent means*, or in making profits by the *handling of merely fictitious values.* Whilst these definitions banish from the financial field those bogus agreements which rest on no real foundation, they do not exclede a *bona fide* contract to deliver in a given time goods which are not yet in the hands of the seller but which he is morally certain to have in readiness at the time agreed with the buyer.

Almost every form of speculation known to modern finance, is mentioned by Mr. Janet, and submitted to a searching scrutiny with regard both to its ethical and to its economical soundness. The various combinations of capital, such as *Trusts, Pools and Syndicates* receive due consideration. He does not condemn them wholesale, but only when they try to effect a monopoly, by crushing out of existence every honest competitor, or try to force the price of commodities above their real worth. Moreover he shows that the most powerful coalitions, when managed in defiance of moral or economic laws, are bound to end in disaster; witness the fate of the famous international copper syndicate. Combinations may become necessary when prices have fallen below the cost of production, but no rise can long be kept beyond the point at which a fair compensation is obtained for the labor and capital invested. All this is very true, but yet as these combinations often cause great disturbances and heap great ruins, it were

well to devise some means of warning, or at least of avenging their victims. Great criminals seem to pass with wonderful facility through the meshes of the law, whilst minor offenders are easily detected and severely punished.

The moderation which the author has shown in dealing with speculation and speculators, does not desert him when he speaks of the financial preponderance of the semitic race. He has severe words for the *manipulations* of which their bankers and brokers are sometimes guilty, but he observes that the hands of Christians do not always remain unspotted. In America, the man who has made most money by agiotage, who several times swooped upon the stock exchange, as the Algerine brigantines used to swoop upon the Christian felluccas, that man is not a descendant of Israel. The immense wealth of the Jews is chiefly due to the folly of of those governments that run into extravagant expenses which far exceed their revenues, thus becoming the thrall of money lenders. Like Antonio, they curse the Jew but are glad to get his shekels, little recking of the pound of flesh that shall have to be paid, or of bankruptcy which is worse than the sacrifice of a pound of flesh, for it is ruin and dishonor combined. Moreover, the wealth of the Jews is not due only to their unscrupulous manipulations, or even to the recklessness of the Christians. In the 12th chapter where Mr. Janet sketches the developments of the banking system in this nineteenth century, he gives us an account of the rise of the Rothschild dynasty. The tale is instructive and very well told.

When old Mayer-Amschel Rothschild, whom we might be tempted to call Rothschild 1st, was on the point of being gathered to his fathers, he called his five sons to his bedside and spoke as follows: "My sons, remain always faithful to the law of Moses, cling fondly to one another, undertake nothing without consulting your mother: do ye observe these my three commandments, and you shall become wealthy among the wealthy, and the world shall be yours." The Rothschilds have taken to heart these solemn words, and the prophecy is well nigh fulfilled. Might not Christians imitate their thrift and their domestic virtues?

The thirteenth and last chapter of the book contains the conclusions and suggestions of the author. After stating that the nineteenth century has witnessed a great financial progress, he adds with regret that moral worth has not kept pace with the advance of wealth; in fact, a moral deterioration is but too plainly visible. The fall of the rate of interest he considers as a sign of financial strength; yet were the rate to go down as far as 1 or 1.5, he fears capitalization would cease almost completely, and the savings banks would become impossible, at least they could not pay any interest on the deposits of the poor. Mr. Janet insists on the fixedness and stability of political institutions.

Legislation should be modified in order to reach and punish agiotage, without interfering with legitimate speculation. Economic science must be popularized and disseminated. Labor organizations are a necessary counterpoise to the combinations of catital, and should be encouraged by those who can preserve them from lawlessness. Co-operation, especially for

consumption, should be fostered and the State should tend to lighten the charges of the poor. Institutions of credit, to help the poor man to rise, and to make his savings productive, should be so multiplied and developed as to become, in the aggregate, an offset to the great accumulations of capital. Lastly, a coalition of all the honest business men to raise the moral standard of the business world, and stamp out fraudulent speculation, is not only useful, but has become a financial necessity.

Next to the thirteenth chapter will be found a very important appendix on the silver question. Mr. Janet is a mono-metallist, but he wants silver, as a subsidiary metal, to be coined in sufficient quantity to meet the wants of circulation and act as a sort of reserve or balance-wheel to the more precious metal.

This very imperfect sketch will perhaps convey some idea of the importance of the work. It will prove most useful, not only to economists and business men, but also to the friends of the poor and the pastors of souls.

R. I. H.

**RITUS ORDINATIONUM JUXTA PONTIFICALE ROMANUM, Curante Adm. Rev. J. S. M. Lynch, D. D., L. L.D., olim in Seminario Provinciali apud Trojam, N. Y. Sacrae Liturgiae Professore.—Editio secunda correcta et ampliata. Cum Appendice.—Impensis Bibliothecae Cathedralis Neo-Eborancensis. MDCCCXCII.**

The Director of the Cathedral Library of New York has inaugurated a very useful movement in procuring the publication, under the auspices of the Library Association, of a series of liturgical books, equally serviceable for the clergy and laity.

The present volume, which is the second of the series contains a good English translation, with the original Latin on opposite pages, of the ceremonies and prayers used the various ordination-rites from Tonsure to the conferring of the Priesthood.

It must be noted that this book has been prepared with special reference to the help it might afford ecclesiastical students preparing for the reception of Orders. There are useful hints contained in notes, and references to decisions of the Sacred Congregation, and throughout there is evidence of care and of a practical purpose.

The beauty of the ceremonies is often entirely locked to those among the laity who merely witness the outward performance of the sacred functions, without having access to the meaning which underlies them and which gives them the virtue of inspiring greater faith and love for our holy religion. The custom of inviting the friends of the young candidates to witness the ordination would be attended by the most beneficial results if the ceremonies were explained to and understood by the people. One of the most effective ways of bringing this about is to spread the manual of which we speak. Its decidedly handsome make up recommends it in every way